DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 668 CS 009 861

AUTHOR Thomas, Phyllis M.
TITLE Language Development Component, Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading: CLEAR--Reading Recovery Program 1987-88. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 154p.; For 1986-87 report, see ED 290 139.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compensatory Education; Grade 1; Individualized Reading; Primary Education; Reading Achievement; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Remedial Reading; Underachievement
IDENTIFIERS *CLEAR Reading Recovery Program; *Columbus Public Schools OH; Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

The 1987-88 Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading-Recovery (CLEAR-RR) Program of the Columbus, Ohio Public Schools was implemented to provide early intervention to 393 underachieving first-grade pupils in Columbus, Ohio schools who appeared unlikely to learn to read successfully without intensive instruction. The program's two major goals were to develop and provide CLEAR-RR for the first grade pupils and to adapt and apply the inservice program for teachers. Specially trained teachers provided one-on-one half-hour daily lessons during the school year. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis had received 60 or more instructional lessons. Activities included reading and rereading books while the teacher maintained a record of strategies and errors, writing and reading stories, identifying letters, and analyzing sounds in words. Students discontinued the program when they had successfully achieved predetermined levels on the Reading Recovery Diagnostic Survey and the vocabulary and comprehension subtests of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, Levels B and C. Analyses of the standardized test data included comparison of Total Reading scores, pretest to posttest, using percentiles and Normal Curve Equivalents. Results indicated that: (1) the 271 students who completed the program gained an average of 9.6 NCEs; and (2) a staff survey, principal survey, and parent survey indicated that respondents generally viewed the program as effective. Recommendations include continuing the program. (Thirty-three tables of data are included; survey instruments, results, and comments are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313668

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES AND READING
CLEAR-READING RECOVERY PROGRAM

October 1989

Written by:

Phyllis M. Thomas
Professional Specialist

Computer Analysis by:

Kathy L. Morgan
Professional Specialist

Under the Supervision of:

Richard A. Amorose, Ph.D.
and
E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CS009861

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary E. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES AND READING
CLEAR-READING RECOVERY PROGRAM
1987-88

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The purpose of the 1987-88 Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading-Reading Recovery (CLEAR-RR) Program was to provide early intervention to underachieving first-grade pupils who appeared unlikely to learn to read successfully without intensive instruction. The program featured individualized one-to-one lessons provided by specially trained teachers. The lessons were based upon diagnostic instruments designed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the pupil's development of reading and writing strategies. Reading Recovery was first developed in New Zealand by Marie Clay. Data from the New Zealand program indicated that 90% of the pupils were recovered (i.e., successful) after approximately 12 to 14 weeks.

The CLEAR-RR Program was initiated in the Columbus Public Schools in 1984-85 as a pilot project and by 1987-88 was in its fourth year. The program was a joint effort of educators in the Columbus Public Schools, The Ohio State University, and the Ohio Department of Education. In 1987-88 the CLEAR-RR Program was located in 26 elementary schools, had a staff of 57 teachers (29 FTEs) and served 393 pupils. Teachers normally served half-time in the program and half-time as first-grade teachers.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes the CLEAR-RR Program started on September 21, 1987 and continued through May 13, 1988. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analyses must have received 60 or more instructional lessons or have been discontinued (completed) from the program.

Activities: To help pupils develop reading strategies daily 30-minute lessons included a variety of instructional activities, such as, reading and re-reading books while the teacher recorded their strategies and errors, writing and reading their own stories, letter identification, and sound analysis of words.

Achievement Objective: Pupils were to receive CLEAR-RR instruction until they were ready to be discontinued from the program. Discontinued pupils were those who successfully completed the program according to (a) predetermined levels on diagnostic measures indicating that the pupils were reading at the average level for their respective classrooms, and (b) teacher judgement that the pupils had developed effective reading strategies and could learn in the normal classroom setting without extra individual help.

Evaluation Design: The evaluation questions were based upon two major program goals: to develop and provide CLEAR-RR for first-grade pupils, and to adapt and apply inservice for program teachers. Questions were asked in the following areas: (a) service patterns; (b) performance levels on a standardized test of reading; (c) performance levels on six diagnostic measures; (d) pupil performance in CLEAR-RR versus other compensatory

programs; (e) attitudes of professional staff; (f) attitudes of parents; (g) costs of CLEAR-RR versus other programs; and (h) long-term effects.

The major evaluation effort was accomplished through the administration of two tests: a) The Reading Recovery Diagnostic Survey yielded scores for six subtests (see below); and b) The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills, (CTBS, 1981) included the Vocabulary and Oral Comprehension pretest, Level B, and the Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension posttest, Level C. Analyses of the standardized test data included percentiles, homeroom average NCE scores, and pretest-posttest NCE gains. Locally-constructed instruments were used to collect enrollment/attendance and survey (attitude) data.

Major Findings/Recommendations: The CLEAR-RR Program served 393 pupils in 1987-88. The average pupil enrollment was 84.5 days; the average attendance was 71.6 days; and the average number of instructional lessons was 56.2. Program developers have estimated that most pupils need approximately 60 lessons to complete the program. Of the 191 pupils who received 60 or more lessons, 63.4% (121) were discontinued.

A total of 271 pupils were either discontinued (201) or received 60 or more lessons (70). Of this group, 253 pupils had valid scores for both the CTBS pretest and posttest and were included in the evaluation sample.

In Total Reading the median percentile scores on the pretest and posttest were 14.0 and 26.0. The mean NCE scores on the pretest and posttest were 26.9 and 36.5. The average growth was 9.6 NCEs. Overall, 58.5% of the 253 evaluation sample pupils gained 7.0 or more NCEs. The percentages of pupils who were at various percentile levels on the posttest were as follows: (a) 15.0% (38) were at the 50%ile or above (grade level); and (b) 66.8% (169) were below the 37%ile (still eligible for Chapter 1 services).

On the Reading Recovery Diagnostic Survey, 249 pupils who were in the CLEAR-RR evaluation sample obtained the following mean scores in September and May: Letter Identification, 3.1 and 51.5; Ohio Word Test, .5 and 15.3; Concepts About Print, 7.4 and 16.7; Writing Vocabulary, 2.8 and 37.4; Dictation, 4.6 and 30.9. The median scores for the September and May Text Reading Levels were -1.0 (level A) and 10.0 (level 10). The Text Reading Levels had approximate equivalents in the Ginn basal reading series. These were the levels at which pupils could read with 90% accuracy or above.

NCE growth in CLEAR-RR and other compensatory programs operating in grade 1 could not be compared because most of the CLEAR-RR pupils were also in another program. The cost per pupil served in the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR Program ($2864) indicated that CLEAR-RR was expensive in comparison to the other programs, with costs per pupil served of $1,022 for Regular CLEAR (grade 1); $626 for the Instructional Aide Program; and $1,001 for Regular CLEAR (grades 1-5).

Results of the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and Principal Survey indicated that respondents generally viewed the program as effective. On a scale measuring program effectiveness that ranged from +2 to -2, the average ratings for the program ranged from 1.7 to .1. The area of parent involvement received the lowest mean rating from both groups. Respondents agreed with statements regarding the value of the program, the use of whole language instruction in regular classrooms, and support for program funding. On a scale that ranged from +2 (strongly agree) to -2 (strongly disagree) the average responses to these items ranged from 1.9 to 1.7.

The Classroom Teacher Survey included ratings related to the reading performance in 1987-88 of pupils who received CLEAR-RR in 1986-87. On a scale that ranged from +2 (successful) to -2 (unsuccessful), the average ratings on four reading items were as follows. For grade 1 (retained) pupils, the average ratings ranged from .1 to -.6. For grade 2 pupils, these average ratings ranged from .5 to .1. Within grade 2, the average ratings for discontinued pupils ranged from .6 to .2 and for not discontinued pupils ranged from -.2 to -.6. Teachers reported that 45.0% (10) of the former CLEAR-RR pupils in grade 1 and 64.3% (45) of the pupils in grade 2 achieved passing scores on basal tests of comprehension.

Parents who responded to the Parent Survey indicated that they were glad their children were in the program and thought it had helped their children. Parents reported an average of 3.5 contacts during the school year with the CLEAR-RR teacher, however, a number of parents reported no contacts. Specifically, 36.7% (22) said they did not initiate any contacts with the teacher, 14.8% (9) reported no teacher-initiated contacts, and 9.7% (6) reported no contacts of either type. Because of the relatively low (25.6%) return rate for the survey, respondents may not be representative of the entire group of program parents.

Results of analyses of the long-term effects of CLEAR-RR revealed the following. Of the former CLEAR-RR pupils who were in a school and at a grade level where a compensatory education program was in operation in 1987-88, 42.0% (37) of the pupils from the 1985-86 evaluation sample and 52.0% (66) of the pupils from the 1986-87 evaluation sample were still being served in a compensatory education program. Of the 517 pupils from the the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 samples who remained in the Columbus Public Schools through November 1988, 72.3% (374) followed a normal grade-level progression. The retention rates in grade 1 were: 25.5% for the 1985-86 evaluation sample as of November 1986, 20.8% for the 1986-87 evaluation sample as of November 1987, 15.2% for the 1987-88 evaluation sample as of November 1988, and 19.1% for the 517 pupils in the three evaluation samples combined. The retention rates in grade 2 were: 19.8% for the 1985-86 sample as of November 1987 and 11.9% for the 1986-87 sample as of November 1988. The percentages of pupils from the evaluation samples who were served in special education were: For the 1985-86 evaluation sample, 14.1% in November 1986, 10.9% in November 1987, and 17.1% in November 1988; for the 1986-87 evaluation sample, 6.6% in November 1987 and 10.8% in November 1988; and for the 1987-88 evaluation sample, 14.4% in November 1988. Pupils were served more frequently for communication disorders related to speech and hearing problems than for developmental handicaps and learning disabilities combined.

Based on evaluation results it is recommended that the CLEAR-RR Program be continued. Additional recommendations are: a) to continue funding at the current level; b) to explore the retention problems in grades 1 and 2; c) to provide service to more pupils with current staff; d) to coordinate efforts of CLEAR-RR and the Instructional Aide Program or separate the two programs to eliminate joint service; e) to share CLEAR-RR approaches with other teachers; f) to improve parent involvement; g) to use criteria other than the classroom average for discontinuing pupils and to follow the progress of discontinued pupils in subsequent years; h) to compare pupil progress in CLEAR-RR and the CLEAR-Elementary Program; and i) to investigate alternatives for using Reading Recovery techniques in small groups in order to serve more pupils.

EVALSRVCS/P501/ABSCRR88
06/02/89

Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
COMPENSATORY LANGUAGE EXPERIENCES AND READING
CLEAR-READING RECOVERY PROGRAM

April 1989

Program Description

The purpose of the 1987-88 Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading - Reading Recovery (CLEAR-RR) Program was to provide early intervention to underachieving first-grade pupils who appeared unlikely to learn to read successfully without intensive instruction. To accomplish this purpose the program featured individualized one-to-one lessons 30 minutes daily provided by specially trained teachers. The lessons were based upon diagnostic instruments which were designed to provide a comprehensive assessment of the pupil's development of reading and writing strategies.

Reading Recovery was developed in New Zealand by Marie Clay, a renowned psychologist and educator. Dr. Clay's early intervention program has been employed increasingly in New Zealand since 1976, with encouraging results. Throughout the years children at risk of reading failure have made exceptional progress in learning to read. Often, as many as 90% of the pupils have been able to work within the average range in their classrooms after approximately 12 to 14 weeks of individual tutoring (Clay, 1985). Reading Recovery has fit in well with the whole language approaches used to teach all children to read in New Zealand which is, according to Becoming a Nation of Readers (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985), the most literate country in the world.

The Columbus Public Schools was the first school system in the United States to attempt a Reading Recovery program. The CLEAR-RR Program first operated in the Columbus Public Schools during the 1984-85 school year as a pilot project. The program was initiated as a joint effort of educators in the Columbus Public Schools, The Ohio State University (OSU), and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), with assistance from Marie Clay, Barbara Watson, and others from New Zealand. Funding for the CLEAR-RR Program was provided by Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA).

During the first four years (1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88) the CLEAR-RR Program was in operation in the Columbus Public Schools, the program was expanded each year in terms of the number of participating teachers, schools, and pupils (see Table 1). For example, the size of the program staff has expanded from 14 CLEAR-RR teachers (7 FTEs) in the pilot year (1984-85) to 57 CLEAR-RR teachers (29 FTEs) in 1987-88. The number of elementary schools served by the program was increased from 6 schools in the pilot year to 26 schools in 1987-88. The number of first-grade pupils served in the program was increased from approximately 70 pupils in the pilot year to 393 pupils in 1987-88.

Table 1

Number of Teachers, Teacher Full-time Equivalents (FTEs), Schools, and Pupils Participating in the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program in the Columbus Public Schools by School Year

School Year	Teachers[a]	Teacher FTEs	Schools	Pupils Served
1984-85[b]	14	7	6	70
1985-86	30	16	12	224
1986-87	52	26	20	335
1987-88	57	29	26	393

[a]Plus support staff including 4 teacher leaders and OSU-affiliated personnel.
[b]Pilot year

CLEAR-RR teachers normally were assigned to schools in teams of two. Each teacher served half-time in the CLEAR-RR Program and half-time as a first-grade teacher. During the half-day she served in the program, the CLEAR-RR teacher worked with 4 or 5 pupils individually for 30 minutes each. One member of the team taught Reading Recovery in the morning while the other member taught a first grade class. Their assignments were reversed in the afternoon.

In 1987-88, 58 teachers were assigned initially to the CLEAR-RR Program on a half-time basis. Because one of the teachers died in the beginning of the school year, another CLEAR-RR teacher was assigned to the program on a full-time basis. Thus, there were 57 CLEAR-RR teachers (56 half-time and 1 full-time) for a total of 29 FTEs. Several support personnel from OSU and the school system also were engaged in working with CLEAR-RR pupils.

In 1987-88 the CLEAR-RR Program was located in the following 26 elementary schools.

Schools Served by the
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program
1987-88

Beck	Highland	Ohio
Burroughs	Hubbard	Pilgrim
Clarfield	Leawood	Reeb
Como	Linden	Southwood
Cranbrook	Livingston	Sullivant
Dana	Main	Weinland Park
East Columbus	Maize	West Broad
Eastgate	Medary	Windsor
Heyl	North Linden	

The 26 schools were staffed by program teachers as follows: 22 schools were each served by 2 CLEAR-RR teachers, 3 schools were each served by 4 CLEAR-RR teachers, and 1 school was served by the 1 full-time CLEAR-RR teacher.

The program teachers received support from 4 teacher leaders who served as trainers, resource teachers, and program coordinators. The teacher leaders taught a required credit course for the first-year Reading Recovery teachers and provided inservice training for the experienced program teachers. Training included demonstration lessons taught "behind the glass" by program teachers while others observed and the teacher leaders discussed the lessons. The teacher leaders also provided resource materials, communicated program policies, and coordinated record keeping for the program.

In the Columbus Public Schools the format for diagnosis developed by Clay and others was followed with minor revisions. At the beginning of the school year first-grade pupils who appeared to be most in need of reading help took the Diagnostic Survey of reading and writing tests: Letter Identification, Ohio Word Test, Concepts About Print, Writing Vocabulary, Dictation Test, and Text Reading Level. These tests were also administered at various times

throughout the school year as pupils entered or exited the program and again at the conclusion of the program year.

Pupils were selected for the CLEAR-RR Program based on two criteria: (a) a qualifying score on a selection test and (b) low scores on the Diagnostic Survey. Scores at or below the 36th percentile on the selection test indicated that the pupils were qualified to be served in the ECIA Chapter 1 funded CLEAR-RR Program. Low scores on the diagnostic tests further indicated that the pupils were not likely to learn to read successfully in a regular classroom environment without extra individual help. Selection of pupils occurred prior to the program norm-referenced pretest.

Each pupil enrolled in the program spent approximately the first 10 days "Roaming In the Known." During this period the CLEAR-RR teacher built rapport with the pupil and provided an opportunity for the pupil to use the strategies he or she already knew in meaningful reading and writing activities. Once the Reading Recovery lessons began, a familiar pattern was established. A typical 30-minute lesson included most or all of the following activities.

1. Two or more familiar books from previous lessons were selected by the pupil to be read to the teacher.

2. The teacher made a running record while the pupil read the book that was introduced to the pupil and attempted on the previous day. During this time the CLEAR-RR teacher changed the focus from instruction to observation. Meaning, structure, and visual cues were analyzed to determine which cues were used or neglected by the pupil. Each day the teacher carefully recorded the pupil's development of reading strategies (e.g., self-monitoring, searching for cues, cross-checking, self-correcting) or the ability to determine the meaning of continuous text.

3. During letter identification, plastic letters were used on a magnetic board.

4. The pupil dictated a story and then learned to write and read it with the teacher's help.

5. During sound analysis of words from the written story, the pupil was encouraged to say the word slowly and write what could be heard.

6. The completed story was cut into separate words and rearranged in the correct order by the pupil.

7. A new book was introduced by the teacher.

8. The new book was attempted by the pupil.

When it was determined by the CLEAR-RR teacher, in consultation with the classroom teacher and the teacher leader, that a pupil had made sufficient progress to work successfully in the normal classroom setting without extra

help, the pupil was recommended to be discontinued. Discontinued pupils were defined as those who had successfully completed the program according to predetermined levels on the diagnostic measures and had been released from the program. When pupils left the program (e.g., were discontinued, moved from the school, were placed in special programs), then pupils on the waiting list entered the program.

Evaluation Design

As of Fall 1987, no specific evaluation objectives had been determined within the school system. An evaluation design was developed based on two goals identified from the 1984-85 proposal:

1. To develop and provide the CLEAR-RR Program for first-grade pupils.

   The individual child who has been identified as being "at risk" of failure has recovered essential reading strategies and can function satisfactorily in the regular classroom.

2. To adapt and apply the necessary inservice program for teachers.

   To implement the Reading Recovery techniques, teachers will receive intensive training over the period of a year while simultaneously implementing the program with children through clinical and peer-critiquing experiences guided by a skilled instructor.

Based on these two goals, eight evaluation questions regarding the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR Program were developed. The questions focused on the following areas: service patterns, pretest-posttest performance on a standardized test of reading and on diagnostic measures of reading, pupil performance in CLEAR-RR compared to other compensatory programs, attitudes of professional staff and program parents, costs of CLEAR-RR versus other compensatory programs, and long-term effects of the program. The specific evaluation questions and analyses for each are listed below.

Question 1 What were the service patterns of the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 1.1 Number of pupils who were served.

Analysis 1.2 Number of pupils who were discontinued.

Analysis 1.3 Demographic characteristics of pupils who were served.

Analysis 1.4 Demographic characteristics of pupils who were discontinued.

Question 2 What were the performance levels of pupils discontinued or with 60 or more lessons on a standardized test of reading?

Analysis 2.1 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 50%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.2 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 37%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.3 Number and percent of pupils reaching the average NCE for their room on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS. (Analysis will be based on available data. Availability of data will come from schools involved in other programs requiring total school testing.)

Analysis 2.4 Number and percent of pupils who have shown a gain of 7.0 NCE points between pretest and posttest in Total Reading and Reading Comprehension on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.5 Analysis of central tendency and distribution of NCE scores on the pretest and posttest of Total Reading and Reading Comprehension on the CTBS.

Question 3 What were the pretest and posttest levels of performance of pupils on the six diagnostic measures employed in the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 3.1 Descriptive data (mean, median, alpha, standard deviation) on pretest and posttest diagnostic measures.

Analysis 3.2 Comparison of Text Reading Levels of pupils pre and post using appropriate non-parametric statistics.

Question 4 How did CLEAR-RR pupils compare to pupils in other compensatory programs?

Analysis 4.1 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 37%ile and the 50%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 4.2 Comparison of distribution of posttest CTBS scores using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic.

Question 5 What were the attitudes toward Reading Recovery of teachers participating in the program, of principals in schools served by CLEAR-RR, and of teachers who had pupils in 1987-88 who were served by CLEAR-RR in the 1986-87 school year?

Analysis 5.1 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of program teachers (CLEAR-RR Staff Survey).

Analysis 5.2 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of principals in schools served by CLEAR-RR (Principal Survey).

Analysis 5.3 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of teachers who had pupils in 1987-88 who were served by CLEAR-RR in the 1986-87 school year and who were in the 1986-87 evaluation sample (Classroom Teacher Survey).

Question 6 What were the attitudes toward Reading Recovery of parents of pupils participating in the program?

Analysis 6.1 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of parents of pupils in CLEAR-RR during 1987-88 (Parent Survey).

Question 7 What were the costs of CLEAR-RR compared to other compensatory programs?

Analysis 7.1 Cost per pupil of each program.

Analysis 7.2 NCE gain in reading for each program.

Analysis 7.3 Cost of gain of 1.0 NCE point for each program.

Question 8 What were the long-term effects of the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 8.1 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who in 1987-88 attended a school where a compensatory program was available and who were served by a compensatory program.

Analysis 8.2 Number and percent of pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample scoring at or above the mean NCE for their classroom on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.3 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples scoring at or above the 37%ile on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.4 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples scoring at or above the 50%ile on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.5 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who followed a normal grade-level progression.

Analysis 8.6 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who were later identified and served in a special education class.

The evaluation design provided for the collection of data in the following six areas of operation for the overall program.

1. The September Information Form (SIF) was a computer printout listing all pupils tested at the beginning of the school year and their pretest scores on the diagnostic tests. Pupils most in need of CLEAR-RR services were selected from this list by CLEAR-RR staff with the assistance of their teacher leaders.

2. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Pupil Service Form (PSF) was a computer generated preprinted form for each CLEAR-RR pupil. The form was completed by the CLEAR-RR teacher upon official entry of each pupil into the program (see Appendix A).

3. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Data Form (CRRDF) was used by program teachers to keep enrollment/attendance data, number of lessons, diagnostic information, discontinued status, and service patterns for each pupil served (see Appendix B).

4. The May Information Form (MIF) was a computer printout listing all pupils tested in the spring and their posttest scores on the diagnostic tests.

5. The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS, 1981) was used as the pretest and posttest for all pupils in the CLEAR-RR Program. This test series has empirical norms for fall and spring, established October 6 - 10, 1980, and April 27 to May 1, 1981. The description of the CTBS pretest and posttest is as follows:

	Level	Form	Recommended Grade Range	Subtests	Number of Items
Pretest	B	U	K.6-1.6	Vocabulary	17
				Oral Comprehension	15
				Total Reading	32
Posttest	C	U	1.0-1.9	Vocabulary	25
				Reading Comprehension	25
				Total Reading	50

The CTBS tests were administered by classroom and program teachers. Pretesting occurred September 21-25, 1987. Posttesting occurred April 18-22, 1988. All testing was done on level, as indicated in the table above.

6. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Surveys were used to obtain information from staff members and program parents. The four surveys were: CLEAR-RR Staff Survey, Principal Survey, Classroom Teacher Survey, and Parent Survey (see Appendices C-F). Data collection was completed in May 1988.

Data collection for the CLEAR-RR Program also included parent involvement information and inservice evaluation information, data which were not

specified in the CLEAR-RR evaluation design but were collected routinely for other ECIA Chapter 1 programs. This information is not included here but has been submitted to the Department of Federal and State Programs.

Definition of Terms

Pupil Categories

Pupils Served: Pupils who were enrolled in the program and had a completed Pupil Service Form (PSF) and CLEAR-Reading Recovery Data Form (CRRDF)

- Discontinued Pupils: Pupils served who had successfully completed the program according to (a) predetermined levels on diagnostic measures indicating the pupils were reading at the average level for their respective classrooms and (b) the combined judgement of CLEAR-RR teachers and teacher leaders, with input from classroom teachers, that the pupils had developed effective reading strategies and were capable of learning in the normal classroom setting without extra individual help (Note: Criteria for discontinuing did not include the completion of a specific number of lessons.)

- Not Discontinued Pupils (lessons $\geq$ 60): Pupils served who were not discontinued and had 60 or more lessons

- Other Pupils Served (lessons $<$ 60): Pupils served who were not discontinued and had fewer than 60 lessons

Treatment Group: Discontinued pupils, and not discontinued pupils

Evaluation Sample: Pupils in the treatment group who had a valid CTBS Total Reading score for both pretest and posttest

Reading Assessments

Selection Test: The Metropolitan Achievement Test (Metro), 1978, Form JS, Primer Level, Reading Survey Test; administered prior to the pretest (Note: Pupils who scored at or below the 36th percentile qualified for the CLEAR-RR Program.)

Pretest: The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), 1981, Form U, Level B; Subtests: Vocabulary and Oral Comprehension (The two subtests yield a combined score for Total Reading.)

Posttest: The Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), 1981, Form U, Level C; Subtests: Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension (The two subtests yield a combined score for Total Reading.)

Diagnostic Survey: A set of six diagnostic measures individually administered at the beginning of the program, upon sufficient pupil progress to test for discontinuing, and at the end of the program year: Letter Identification, Ohio Word Test, Concepts About Prints, Writing Vocabulary, Dictation Test, Text Reading Level.

Major Findings

Question 1 What were the service patterns of the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 1.1 Number of pupils who were served.

Analysis 1.2 Number of pupils who were discontinued.

Analysis 1.3 Demographic characteristics of pupils who were served.

Analysis 1.4 Demographic characteristics of pupils who were discontinued.

The service patterns of the CLEAR-RR Program are reported below in the following order: the number of pupils who were served and their demographic characteristics; the number of pupils who were and were not discontinued and related demographic analyses; data on enrollment and attendance; the number of lessons received; and a description of the evaluation sample.

The 1987-88 CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program served a total of 393 first-grade pupils in 26 schools (see Table 1, page 2). Pupils were served 30 minutes daily, for an average of 2.5 hours of instruction per week.

The demographic characteristics (gender, race, and socio-economic status) of the 393 pupils who were served in the program were analyzed from the school district's Student Master File (SMF), Pupil Information File (PIF), and November 1987 official enrollment tape. The data were based on information reported by parents and/or school personnel. Of the pupils served, 55.7% (219) were boys and 44.3% (174) were girls (see Table 2). As for the distribution by race, almost half -- 48.3% (190) of the pupils served were identified as Non-Minority, almost half -- 49.6% (195) were Black, and the remaining 2.0% (8) were Other Minority (see Table 3). The Other Minority category included Spanish Surname, Asian American, and American Indian. Socio-economic status was indicated by pupil eligibility for subsidized (free or reduced-price) lunch as of November 1987. Of the 393 pupils served, 66.7% (262) were on free lunch, 6.1% (24) were on reduced-price lunch, 26.0% (102) were not on subsidized lunch, and the status of the remaining 1.3% (5 pupils) was unknown (see Table 4).

For evaluation purposes, the pupils served in the program were divided into three pupil categories: discontinued pupils (those who had successfully completed the program), not discontinued pupils (with 60 or more lessons), and other pupils served (with fewer than 60 lessons). Pupil categories are defined more specifically in the Definition of Terms section of this report. The use of the 60 lesson distinction was based upon the premise in Clay's study which determined that an average of 60 lessons was needed for pupils to be discontinued and to continue to work successfully in the normal classroom setting. Of the 393 pupils served, about half -- 51.1% (201) were discontinued, 17.8% (70) were not discontinued (with 60 or more lessons), and 31.0% (122) were other pupils served (see Table 5). The average number of pupils served by each of the 29 full-time equivalent teacher teams was 13.6 pupils and the average number of pupils discontinued by each team was 6.9 pupils.

Table 2

Percent and Number of CLEAR-RR Pupils Served by Gender 1987-88

Gender	%	(N)
Boys	55.7	(219)
Girls	44.3	(174)
Total	100.0	(393)

Table 3

Percent and Number of CLEAR-RR Pupils Served by Race 1987-88

Race	%	(N)
Non-Minority	48.3	(190)
Black	49.6	(195)
Other Minority[a]	2.0	(8)
Total	99.9[b]	(393)

[a]Includes Spanish Surname, Asian American, and American Indian
[b]Due to rounding

Table 4

Percent and Number of CLEAR-RR Pupils Served by Subsidized Lunch Status 1987-88

Subsidized Lunch Status	%	(N)
Free	66.7	(262)
Reduced	6.1	(24)
Neither	26.0	(102)
Unknown	1.3	(5)
Total	100.1[a]	(393)

Note. Based on November 1987 data
[a]Due to rounding

In order to determine whether or not there were any differences in the percentages of pupils discontinued by gender or by race, Analysis 1.4 was expanded. Results of these analyses did show differences (see Table 5).

Specifically, 59.8% of the girls were discontinued, compared with 44.3% of the boys -- a difference of 15.5%. Furthermore, more girls than boys were discontinued -- 104 girls compared with 97 boys -- even though more boys than girls were served in the program (see Table 5). By contrast, a greater percentage of boys than girls received fewer than 60 lessons.

The analysis by race indicated that 62.5% of Other Minority pupils were discontinued, compared with 54.7% of Non-Minority pupils, and 47.2% of Black pupils. Although the percentage of Other Minority pupils discontinued was higher than the percentages discontinued for the other two groups, only 8 Other Minority pupils were served in the program. Most of the pupils served were either Non-Minority or Black. A greater percentage of Black pupils than Non-Minority or Other Minority pupils received fewer than 60 lessons.

CLEAR-RR teachers reported data on program enrollment and program attendance for the 393 pupils served. The number of days of program enrollment ranged from 3 days to 148 days, an average of 84.5 days of enrollment per pupil. The number of days of program attendance ranged from 3 days to 143 days, an average of 71.6 days of attendance per pupil. The differences between the numbers of days of enrollment and attendance were due to pupil absences -- if all pupils had perfect attendance then the enrollment days and the attendance days would have been equal.

Enrollment and attendance data were analyzed further by pupil category. For discontinued pupils, the average enrollment was 94.5 days and the average attendance was 81.5 days. Within this pupil category, the average enrollment for discontinued pupils with 60 or more lessons was 117.1 days and their average attendance was 101.4 days. The average enrollment for discontinued pupils with fewer than 60 lessons was 60.4 days and their average attendance was 51.3 days. For not discontinued pupils with 60 or more lessons, the average enrollment was 132.3 days and the average attendance was 111.7 days. For other pupils served with fewer than 60 lessons, the average enrollment was 40.6 days and the average attendance was 32.1 days.

Although pupil progress probably was affected by attendance, pupil attendance was not used as an evaluation criterion. The completion of 60 lessons was considered a more appropriate criterion.

The number of lessons completed by pupils ranged from none to 122, with an average of 56.2 lessons. Differences between the number of days of attendance and the number of lessons received were mainly due to two practices. First, pupils did not always receive lessons on parent-conference days and teacher-inservice days, although these days were considered indirect service and did count toward attendance. Second, pupils did not receive lessons while they were "Roaming In the Known" during their first 10 days of attendance. Thus, pupils who left the program during these first 10 days received no lessons.

Table 5

Percent and Number of CLEAR-RR Pupils Served
By Pupil Category, Gender, and Race
1987-88

Pupil Category	Gender				Race						Total Pupils	
	Boys		Girls		Non-Minority		Black		Other Minority[a]			
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Discontinued	44.3	(97)	59.8	(104)	54.7	(104)	47.2	(92)	62.5	(5)	51.1	(201)
Not Discontinued (Lessons≥60)	20.0	(44)	14.9	(26)	18.4	(35)	17.4	(34)	12.5	(1)	17.8	(70)
Others Served (Lessons<60)	35.6	(78)	25.3	(44)	26.8	(51)	35.4	(69)	25.0	(2)	31.0	(122)
Total	99.9	(219)	100.0	(174)	99.9	(190)	100.0	(195)	100.0	(8)	99.9	(393)

Note. Due to rounding some total percents do not equal 100.0
[a]Includes Spanish Surname, Asian American, and American Indian

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

An ongoing concern of program planners is how long to serve pupils who appear to make little or no progress after a large number of lessons. Approximately 60 lessons are considered necessary for most pupils to successfully complete the program, however, in 1987-88 the number of lessons needed by pupils to be discontinued varied greatly. For example, one pupil was discontinued after only 5 lessons but another pupil was not discontinued after 122 lessons. The number of lessons completed by pupils who were discontinued ranged from 5 to 117, with an average of 64.8 lessons. The number of lessons completed by pupils who were not discontinued and other pupils served (the two other pupil categories combined) ranged from none to 122, with an average of 47.2 lessons. Of the 191 pupils who received 60 or more lessons, 63.4% (121) were discontinued and 36.6% (70) were not discontinued. A distribution of the number of lessons completed by pupils in the three pupil categories is shown in Table 6.

Because of the expectation that pupils needed approximately 60 lessons to successfully complete the program, the treatment group was limited to the 201 pupils who were discontinued and the 70 additional pupils who had a minimum of 60 lessons (a total of 271 pupils). Thus, the 122 other pupils served were excluded from the treatment group. The evaluation sample was restricted to those pupils who were in the treatment group, had both pretest and posttest administrations of the standardized achievement test (CTBS), and had a valid CTBS Total Reading score for both pretest and posttest. Of the 271 pupils in the treatment group, 18 pupils were excluded from the evaluation sample because of incomplete test data. The evaluation sample was comprised of the remaining 253 pupils, which was 93.4% of the treatment group and 64.4% of the 393 pupils served.

Table 6

Percent and Number of CLEAR-RR Pupils Served
by Pupil Category and Number of Lessons
1987-88

Number of Lessons	Pupil Category: Discontinued Pupils[a] %	(N)	Not Discontinued Pupils[b] %	(N)	Other Pupils Served[c] %	(N)	Total Pupils Served %	(N)
Fewer than 60								
0	0.0	(0)			10.7	(13)	3.3	(13)
1-9	1.5	(3)			23.8	(29)	8.1	(32)
10-19	4.0	(8)			22.1	(27)	8.9	(35)
20-29	5.5	(11)			13.1	(16)	6.9	(27)
30-39	9.0	(18)			12.3	(15)	8.4	(33)
40-49	9.0	(18)			9.0	(11)	7.4	(29)
50-59	10.9	(22)			9.0	(11)	8.4	(33)
Subtotal	39.8	(80)			100.0	(122)	51.4	(202)
60 or More								
60-69	16.9	(34)	11.4	(8)			10.7	(42)
70-79	9.5	(19)	4.3	(3)			5.6	(22)
80-89	13.9	(28)	18.6	(13)			10.4	(41)
90-99	10.9	(22)	30.0	(21)			10.9	(43)
100-109	4.0	(8)	24.3	(17)			6.4	(25)
110-119	5.0	(10)	8.6	(6)			4.1	(16)
120-129	0.0	(0)	2.9	(2)			.5	(2)
Subtotal	60.2	(121)	100.1	(70)			48.6	(191)
Total	100.0	(201)	100.1	(70)	100.0	(122)	100.0	(393)

Note. Due to rounding the sum of percents do not always equal subtotal or total percents or 100.0.

[a] Discontinued pupils could have any number of lessons

[b] Not discontinued pupils with 60 or more lessons

[c] Other pupils served with fewer than 60 lessons

Question 2 What were the performance levels of pupils discontinued or with 60 or more lessons on a standardized test of reading?

Analysis 2.1 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 50%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.2 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 37%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.3 Number and percent of pupils reaching the average NCE for their room on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS. (Analysis will be based on available data. Availability of data will come from schools involved in other programs requiring total school testing.)

Analysis 2.4 Number and percent of pupils who have shown a gain of 7.0 NCE points between pretest and posttest in Total Reading and Reading Comprehension on the CTBS.

Analysis 2.5 Analysis of central tendency and distribution of NCE scores on the pretest and posttest of Total Reading and Reading Comprehension on the CTBS.

CTBS posttest scores from April 1988 were analyzed for the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample and for certain subgroups within the evaluation sample (see Tables 7-10). A number of pupils scored at or above the 37%ile (the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off score) on the pretest. Some analyses of posttest scores were conducted excluding these pupils. A total of 55 pupils who scored at or above the cut-off score on the Oral Comprehension pretest and 36 pupils who scored at or above the cut-off score on the Total Reading pretest were excluded from these analyses. A total of 52 pupils were in the evaluation sample although they were discontinued or had completed their 60th lesson after the posttest was administered. Some analyses of posttest scores were conducted excluding these pupils. Additional analyses were conducted excluding pupils who met either of the previous conditions, that is, they had a pretest score at or above the cut-off score or they were discontinued or received their 60th lesson after the posttest administration. The preceding subgroup analyses were conducted for the entire evaluation sample and also by pupil category within the evaluation sample.

The results of Analyses 2.1 and 2.2 indicated that on the Reading Comprehension posttest, 39.1% (99) of the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample scored at or above the 37%ile and 13.8% (35) scored at or above the 50%ile. On the Total Reading posttest, 33.2% (84) of the pupils scored at or above the 37%ile and 15.0% (38) scored at or above the 50%ile. The percentages of pupils in the 1987-88 evaluation sample who scored at or above the specified percentiles on the CTBS in April 1988 were lower than the percentages of pupils in the 1986-87 evaluation sample who scored at or above the specified percentiles in April 1987. The percentages of the 1986-87 evaluation sample who scored at or above the 37%ile and 50%ile were as follows. On Reading Comprehension, 45.5% (86) scored at or above the 37%ile and 24.3% (46) scored at or above the 50%ile. On Total Reading, 38.6% (73) scored at or above the 37%ile and 18.5% scored at or above the 50%ile.

Table 7

Percent and Number of Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Who Reached the 37%ile and/or 50%ile on the CTBS Reading Comprehension Posttest
by Pupil Category and Subcategory
1987-88

Pupil Category											
Discontinued						Not Discontinued (60 or more lessons)					
		Posttest						Posttest			
		37%ile		50%ile				37%ile		50%ile	
Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Discontinued	(187)	50.3	(94)	18.2	(34)	Not Discontinued	(66)	7.6	(5)	1.5	(1)
Discontinued by Posttest	(88)	70.5	(62)	27.3	(24)	Not Discontinued by Posttest	(113)	19.5	(22)	6.2	(7)
Discontinued & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(138)	44.9	(62)	13.8	(19)	Not Discontinued & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(60)	5.0	(3)	1.7	(1)
Discontinued by Posttest & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(59)	66.1	(39)	20.3	(12)	Not Discontinued by Posttest & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(100)	16.0	(16)	6.0	(6)

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

Table 8

Percent and Number of Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Who Reached the 37%ile and/or 50%ile on the CTBS Total Reading Posttest
by Pupil Category and Subcategory
1987-88

Pupil Category											
Discontinued						Not Discontinued (60 or more lessons)					
		Posttest						Posttest			
		37%ile		50%ile				37%ile		50%ile	
Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Discontinued	(187)	43.9	(82)	19.8	(37)	Not Discontinued	(66)	3.0	(2)	1.5	(1)
Discontinued by Posttest	(88)	64.8	(57)	28.4	(25)	Not Discontinued by Posttest	(113)	13.3	(15)	8.0	(9)
Discontinued & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(153)	39.9	(61)	15.0	(23)	Not Discontinued & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(64)	1.6	(1)	1.6	(1)
[illegible]continued [illegible]Posttest & [illegible]al Reading Pretest<37%ile	(66)	62.1	(41)	21.2	(14)	Not Discontinued by Posttest & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(109)	12.9	(14)	7.3	(8)

Table 9

Percent and Number of Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Who Reached the 37%ile and/or 50%ile on the CTBS Reading Comprehension and/or
Total Reading Posttest by Pupil Subcategory
1987-88

Subtest											
Reading Comprehension						Total Reading					
		Posttest						Posttest			
		37%ile		50%ile				37%ile		50%ile	
Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	Pupil Subcategory	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Evaluation Sample	(253)	39.1	(99)	13.8	(35)	Evaluation Sample	(253)	33.2	(84)	15.0	(38)
Evaluation Sample by Posttest	(201)	41.8	(84)	15.4	(31)	Evaluation Sample by Posttest	(201)	35.8	(72)	16.9	(34)
Evaluation Sample & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(198)	32.8	(65)	10.1	(20)	Evaluation Sample & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(217)	25.6	(62)	11.1	(24)
Evaluation Sample by Posttest & Oral Comp. Pretest<37%ile	(159)	34.6	(55)	11.3	(18)	Evaluation Sample by Posttest & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(175)	31.4	(55)	21.6	(22)

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

Analyses of posttest scores by pupil category and subgroup revealed other differences with regard to the percentage of pupils who score at or above the specified percentiles. For example, 50.3% of the discontinued pupils compared to 7.6% of the not discontinued pupils scored at or above the 37%ile on the Reading Comprehension posttest. Of those who were discontinued or received their 60th lesson by posttest time, the percentages were 70.5% and 19.5% respectively. In all comparisons, the percentages of pupils exceeding the specified percentiles were higher for discontinued pupils than for not discontinued pupils. The percentages also were higher when the pupils who qualified for the evaluation sample after posttest time were excluded than when they were included.

Another way to view program results is to look at the percentage and number of pupils who had posttest scores below the 37%ile, the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off score. Of the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample, 66.8% (169) scored below the cut-off score in Total Reading. That means that approximately two-thirds of the pupils in the evaluation sample still qualified for a Chapter 1 reading program after receiving Reading Recovery instruction. Results of further analyses by pupil category indicated that 56.1% of the discontinued pupils still qualified compared with 97.0% of the not discontinued pupils.

The subgroup with the largest percentage of pupils who still qualified for Chapter 1 after receiving Reading Recovery instruction was comprised of the pupils who were not discontinued and had a Total Reading pretest score below the cut-off. Practically all (98.4%) of these pupils still qualified. The subgroup with the smallest percentage of pupils who still qualified was the pupils who were discontinued by posttest time. Only 35.2% of these pupils still qualified.

For Analysis 2.3, CTBS Reading Comprehension and Total Reading posttest scores were available for 2812 first-grade pupils who were tested in schoolwide project schools in April 1988. NCE scores for pupils in the homerooms of the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample pupils were selected from available data. NCE scores were available for the homerooms of 149 of the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample. For each subtest, the number of scores available per homeroom ranged from 9 to 27 scores. The homeroom average for 1 CLEAR-RR pupil was excluded from the analysis because the average was based on fewer than 10 scores and therefore was considered unrepresentative of the class. The analysis included the remaining 148 pupils, which was 58.5% of the evaluation sample. Of the 148 pupils, 77.7% (115) were discontinued and 22.3% (33) were not discontinued.

Results of Analysis 2.3 were as follows. Of the 148 evaluation sample pupils for whom homeroom averages were calculated, 40.5% (60) reached their homeroom average NCE score in Reading Comprehension and 36.5% (54) reached their homeroom average NCE score in Total Reading. Analysis by pupil category indicated that for Reading Comprehension, 49.6% (57) of the discontinued pupils compared to 9.1% (3) of the not discontinued pupils reached their homeroom average NCE score. For Total Reading, 45.2% (52) of the discontinued pupils compared to 6.1% (2) of the not discontinued pupils reached their homeroom average NCE score. Of the 54 pupils who reached their homeroom average in Total Reading, 25.9% (14) scored below the 37%ile and thereby still qualifying for a Chapter 1 compensatory reading program.

The homeroom average NCE scores varied considerably. The Reading Comprehension homeroom averages ranged from 18.4 to 63.3 NCEs and the Total Reading homeroom averages ranged from 22.4 to 62.2 NCEs.

Because of scaling problems in the pretest-posttest analysis of scores from the Oral Comprehension pretest to the Reading Comprehension posttest, Analyses 2.4 and 2.5 were limited to Total Reading scores (see Table 10). The average change in Total Reading from pretest to posttest was 9.6 NCEs for the entire evaluation sample, 12.1 NCEs for discontinued pupils, and 2.6 NCEs for not discontinued pupils. Overall, 58.5% (148) of the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample gained 7.0 or more NCEs between pretest and posttest compared to 62.6% of discontinued pupils and 47.1% of not discontinued pupils. The largest gain was made by the 66 pupils who were discontinued by posttest time and had Total Reading pretest scores below the cut-off. This group had an average change from pretest to posttest of 19.3 NCEs and 80.3% of the pupils gained the specified NCEs. The smallest gain was made by the not discontinued pupils.

For Analysis 2.5 the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness of Fit Test was run to determine whether or not the distributions of the Total Reading pretest, posttest, and pretest-posttest difference scores were relatively normal. Results indicated that each of the three distributions of 253 scores did not differ significantly from a normal distribution (for the pretest, K-S z = .82, p = .51; for the posttest, K-S z = 1.07, p = .21; for the pretest-posttest distribution, K-S z = .60, p = .86). The means and standard deviations for these distributions are shown in Table 10.

Table 10

Pretest, Posttest, and Change Score Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs)
on CTBS Total Reading Subtest for Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Pupil Subcategory
1987-88

Pupil Subcategory	(N)	Pretest			Posttest			Change		Change ≥ 7 NCEs	
		Mdn %ile	Mean NCE	SD	Mdn %ile	Mean NCE	SD	Mean NCE	SD	%	(N)
Discontinued	(187)	16.0	28.6	14.6	32.0	40.7	10.7	12.1	15.5	62.6	(117)
Discontinued by Posttest	(88)	20.0	30.7	14.5	42.0	45.2	9.2	14.5	15.0	67.1	(59)
Discontinued & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(153)	11.0	24.0	11.6	30.0	39.3	10.5	15.3	14.3	71.2	(109)
Discontinued by Posttest & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(66)	14.0	24.7	11.2	40.5	44.0	9.0	19.3	12.8	80.3	(53)
Not Discontinued	(66)	9.0	22.0	11.8	15.0	24.6	12.8	2.6	15.1	47.1	(31)
Not Discontinued and ≥ 60 lessons by Posttest	(113)	9.0	22.8	12.8	19.0	30.4	13.2	7.6	16.3	57.5	(65)
Not Discontinued & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(64)	9.0	21.0	10.2	15.0	24.3	12.7	3.3	14.7	48.4	(31)
Not Discontinued by Posttest & Total Reading Pretest<37%ile	(109)	9.0	21.6	11.1	19.0	30.2	13.3	8.6	15.5	59.6	(65)
Total Evaluation Sample	(253)	14.0	26.9	14.2	26.0	36.5	13.3	9.6	15.9	58.5	(148)

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
10/11/89

Question 3 What were the pretest and posttest levels of performance of pupils on the six diagnostic measures employed in the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 3.1 Descriptive data (mean, median, alpha, standard deviation) on pretest and posttest diagnostic measures.

Analysis 3.2 Comparison of Text Reading Levels of pupils pre and post using appropriate non-parametric statistics.

Five diagnostic instruments adapted from Clay's Diagnostic Survey and a sixth one measuring text reading level were administered in September and May to all pupils in the CLEAR-RR Program. Pupils were assessed on their ability to: (a) identify 54 upper and lower case letters, (b) read a list of 20 basal words, (c) perform tasks related to 24 concepts about print, (d) write all the words they could in 10 minutes, (e) write the words in a dictated sentence comprised of 37 sounds, and (f) read successive levels of texts to determine the highest level they could read with 90% accuracy or above. The testing text levels, taken from Scott-Foresman passages, have been designated as approximately equivalent to reading selections in the Ginn basal reading series used in the Columbus Public Schools (see Table 11). According to the teacher leaders, the correspondence between the two sets of reading levels are not meant to be an exact one-to-one correspondence. Teacher judgment must be used in determining the appropriate levels for each pupil tested.

A summary of data from the pretest and posttest of diagnostic measures is presented in Table 12. The data are reported for discontinued pupils, not discontinued pupils, and the combined evaluation sample. Scores were available for 249 of the 253 pupils in the evaluation sample. Scores were missing for 3 discontinued pupils and 1 not discontinued pupil. Table 12 does not include the reliability coefficient, Cronbach's Alpha (α). Alpha could not be calculated as planned for the diagnostic pretest and posttest scores because individual item scores were not available for computer analysis.

As shown in Table 12, pupils made gains from the pretest to the posttest on all six measures. On the posttest one or more pupils scored at the ceiling (within approximately 90% of the maximum possible score) on each of the measures except Writing Vocabulary, the one measure that had no maximum score. The numbers of pupils who reached the ceiling on the other five measures were as follows: 229 pupils on Letter Identification; 111 pupils on Ohio Word Test; 5 pupils on Concepts About print; 103 pupils on Dictation, and 4 pupils on Text Reading Level. On Concepts about Print and Text Reading Level the ceiling was reached by discontinued pupils only. On Letter Identification the ceiling also was reached on the pretest.

The mean (average) scores for discontinued pupils were different than those for not discontinued pupils. With the exception of Letter Identification, the mean pretest, posttest, and change scores for discontinued pupils were higher than those for not discontinued pupils. For example, on the Ohio Word Test, the mean pretest scores for both pupil categories were less than 1 word but the mean gain for discontinued pupils was 16.7 words, compared to 9.8 words for not discontinued pupils. On Writing Vocabulary, the mean pretest scores were 3.2 and 1.7 words respectively, but the mean gain for discontinued pupils was 39.8 words, compared to 19.9 words for not discontinued pupils.

Table 11

Approximate Testing Text Reading Level
Equivalents for CLEAR-RR Program
1987-88

Testing Levels	Ginn Basal Series Levels
A-2	Readiness
3-4	Preprimer 1 (PP1)
5-6	Preprimer 2 (PP2)
7-8	Preprimer 3 (PP3)
9-12	Primer
14-16	Grade 1
18-20	Grade 2
22-24	Grade 3
26	Grade 4
28	Grade 5
30	Grade 6

Note. Pupils in the school system who have completed the third preprimer and are beginning the primer level are generally considered eligible for promotion to grade 2.

Table 12

Pretest and Posttest Levels of Performance on Diagnostic Measures for Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample by Pupil Category 1987-88

Diagnostic Measure	Pretest					Posttest					Change	
	Min.	Max.	Mdn.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mdn.	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Letter Identification												
Discontinued	0	53	39.5	35.9	12.3	46	54	53.0	52.5	1.5	16.6	12.4
Not Discontinued	4	52	27.0	25.1	14.2	6	54	51.0	48.8	7.2	23.6	12.9
Evaluation Sample	0	53	36.0	33.1	13.6	6	54	52.0	51.5	4.2	18.5	12.9
Ohio Word Test												
Discontinued	0	5	0.0	.6	1.1	7	20	18.0	17.3	2.6	16.7	2.6
Not Discontinued	0	3	0.0	.2	.5	0	20	9.0	10.0	4.8	9.8	4.7
Evaluation Sample	0	5	0.0	.5	1.0	0	20	17.0	15.3	4.6	14.9	4.5
Concepts About Print												
Discontinued	1	16	8.0	7.9	3.1	9	23	18.0	17.4	2.4	9.5	3.5
Not Discontinued	2	14	6.0	6.2	2.8	7	20	15.0	14.7	2.8	8.5	3.6
Evaluation Sample	1	16	7.0	7.4	3.1	7	23	17.0	16.7	2.8	9.2	3.5
Writing Vocabulary												
Discontinued	0	10	3.0	3.2	2.1	22	77	42.0	43.0	10.9	39.8	10.6
Not Discontinued	0	5	1.0	1.7	1.3	7	40	21.0	21.6	8.3	19.9	7.8
Evaluation Sample	0	10	2.0	2.8	2.1	7	77	38.0	37.4	13.9	34.6	13.2
Dictation Test												
Discontinued	0	26	4.0	5.2	4.9	23	37	34.0	33.0	3.2	27.8	5.7
Not Discontinued	0	14	2.0	2.7	3.2	2	35	26.0	24.8	7.2	22.1	7.2
Evaluation Sample	0	26	3.0	4.6	4.6	2	37	33.0	30.9	5.8	26.3	6.6
Text Reading Level[a]											Mdn.	
Discontinued	-1	2	-1.0	-	-	5	30	12.0	-	-	13.0	-
Not Discontinued	-1	2	-1.0	-	-	1	10	5.0	-	-	6.0	-
Evaluation Sample	-1	2	-1.0	-	-	1	30	10.0	-	-	11.0	-

Note. Discontinued: N = 184, Not Discontinued: N = 65, Evaluation Sample: N = 249. Scores were missing for 3 discontinued pupils and 1 not discontinued pupil. Maximum possible scores were: LI (max. letters = 54), OWT (max. words = 20), CAP (max. concepts = 24), WV (max. words in 10 minutes), DT (max. sounds = 37), TRL (max. level = 30).

[a]Text Reading Level A = -1, Level B = 0 when converted to numerical data. Medians were reported instead of means and standard deviations for this ordinal (i.e., non-interval) measure.

On Letter Identification, the pretest and posttest scores for discontinued pupils also were higher than those for not discontinued pupils but the latter group made larger gains. Specifically, the mean pretest and posttest scores for discontinued pupils were 35.9 and 52.5, an increase of 16.6 letters. The scores for not discontinued pupils were 25.1 and 48.8, an increase of 23.6 letters.

Of particular interest to project personnel are changes in Text Reading Level as it is felt that this is a strong indication of reading improvement. The median pretest scores for discontinued and not discontinued pupils were both approximately at level A (-1.0 when converted to numeric data). The median posttest score for discontinued pupils was 12.0, for not discontinued pupils was 5.0, and for both groups combined was 10.0. Thus, between the pretest and posttest the median score for discontinued pupils increased 13.0 levels compared to 6.0 levels for not discontinued pupils, and 11.0 levels for the combined groups. According to the results of the Wilcoxin Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test, the posttest scores for discontinued pupils (z = -11.76, p <.001), for not discontinued pupils (z = -7.01, p<.001), and for the combined evaluation sample (z = -13.68, p<.001) were significantly higher than the pretest scores.

A further analysis of May Text Reading Level (posttest) by September Text Reading Level (pretest) is shown in Table 13. In September, all 249 pupils tested at levels A, B, 1, or 2. Of these, 132 pupils (53.0%) were at level A and 44 pupils (17.7%) were at level B, the two lowest possible levels. In May, no pupils tested at levels A or B, and only 9 pupils (3.6%) were at levels 1 or 2. The remaining 240 pupils (96.4%) tested at levels 3-30. Moreover, in May, 198 pupils (79.5% of the 249 pupils) tested at level 8 or above, the level at which pupils generally are discontinued at the end of the year if all other factors indicate that the pupils should be discontinued. Furthermore, at each successive September pretest level, a higher percentage of pupils tested at level 8 or above on the May posttest. The percentages of pupils at the various pretest levels who reached level 8 or above on the posttest were: 74.2% of level A, 81.8% of level B, 83.0% of level 1, and 96.2% of level 2.

Table 13

Percent and Number of Pupils In May Text Reading Level By September Text Reading Level for Pupils in CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample 1987-88

May	Text Reading Level September A %	A (N)	B %	B (N)	1 %	1 (N)	2 %	2 (N)	Total %	Total (N)
A										
B										
1	2.3	(3)							1.2	(3)
2	4.5	(6)							2.4	(6)
3	5.3	(7)	6.8	(3)					4.0	(10)
4	4.5	(6)	2.3	(1)					2.8	(7)
5	6.8	(9)	6.8	(3)	10.6	(5)			6.8	(17)
6					2.1	(1)			.4	(1)
7	2.3	(3)	2.3	(1)	4.3	(2)	3.8	(1)	2.8	(7)
8	7.6	(10)	11.4	(5)	14.9	(7)	3.8	(1)	9.2	(23)
9	9.8	(13)	6.8	(3)	10.6	(5)	7.7	(2)	9.2	(23)
10	28.1	(37)	13.6	(6)	14.9	(7)	23.1	(6)	22.5	(56)
11									0.0	
12	15.9	(21)	22.7	(10)	19.1	(9)	15.4	(4)	17.7	(44)
13									0.0	
14	.8	(1)	2.3	(1)	2.1	(1)			1.2	(3)
15									0.0	
16	6.8	(9)	11.4	(5)	2.1	(1)	7.7	(2)	6.8	(17)
17									0.0	
18	3.8	(5)	4.5	(2)	10.6	(5)	23.1	(6)	7.2	(18)
19									0.0	
20					2.1	(1)			.4	(1)
21									0.0	
22	.8	(1)	4.5	(2)	2.1	(1)			1.6	(4)
23									0.0	
24			4.5	(2)	2.1	(1)	3.8	(1)	1.6	(4)
25									0.0	
26					2.1	(1)			.4	(1)
27									0.0	
28							7.7	(2)	.8	(2)
29									0.0	
30	.8	(1)					3.8	(1)	.8	(2)
Total[a]	53.0	(132)	17.7	(44)	18.9	(47)	10.4	(26)	99.8	(249)

Note. Due to rounding total percents do not always equal 100.0.
[a]Percent and number of pupils at Text Reading Levels in September

Question 4 How did CLEAR-RR pupils compare to pupils in other compensatory programs?

Analysis 4.1 Number and percent of pupils reaching the 37%ile and the 50%ile on the Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores on the CTBS.

Analysis 4.2 Comparison of distribution of posttest CTBS scores using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic.

Comparisons of pupils served in the CLEAR-RR Program and those served in other compensatory programs could not be carried out as planned during 1987-88 because most of the CLEAR-RR pupils also were served in another compensatory program. In 1987-88, 89.3% (226) of the 253 pupils in the CLEAR-RR evaluation sample also were served in the Instructional Aide Program, and 1 additional pupil was served in the Instructional Aide Program and the Regular CLEAR Program. Only 10.3% (26 pupils) of the 253 pupils were enrolled in the CLEAR-RR Program only. In an earlier study (Bermel, 1987) CTBS scores for first-grade pupils in the 1985-86 CLEAR-RR Program were compared with scores for first-grade pupils in the Regular CLEAR Program and the Instructional Aide Program. In 1985-86 comparisons could be made because each pupil was enrolled in only one compensatory program.

Question 5 What were the attitudes toward Reading Recovery of teachers participating in the program, of principals in schools served by CLEAR-RR, and of teachers who had pupils in 1987-88 who were served by CLEAR-RR in the 1986-87 school year?

Analysis 5.1 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of program teachers (CLEAR-RR Staff Survey).

Analysis 5.2 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of principals in schools served by CLEAR-RR (Principal Survey).

Analysis 5.3 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of teachers who had pupils in 1987-88 who were served by CLEAR-RR in the 1986-87 school year and who were in the 1986-87 evaluation sample (Classroom Teacher Survey).

In May 1988 separate surveys were mailed to 1987-88 CLEAR-RR staff (program teachers), principals in schools served by CLEAR-RR during 1987-88, and classroom teachers who had pupils in 1987-88 who were in the CLEAR-RR treatment group in the 1986-87 school year. The purposes of the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and Principal Survey were to obtain the staff members' perceptions of the relative effectiveness of the program in selected areas, to determine their agreement with selected statements about the program, and to collect their comments about the CLEAR-RR Program in general. The purposes of the Classroom Teacher Survey were to obtain teacher ratings and related information with regard to the reading performance of pupils during 1987-88 who received the CLEAR-RR Program treatment during the previous school year, to determine teacher agreement with selected statements about the program, and to collect classroom teacher comments about the CLEAR-RR Program in general. Copies of the three surveys are included in Appendices C-E.

CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and Principal Survey

The CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and the Principal Survey were mailed directly to recipients by school mail. The return rates for the two surveys were: 94.7% for the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey (54 usable surveys returned out of 57 mailed), and 84.6% for the Principal Survey (22 usable surveys returned out of 26 mailed).

The CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and the Principal Survey contained many items in common (see Appendices C and D). For items 1-13 on the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and items 1-12 on the Principal Survey, respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of the program in selected areas using a 5-point scale. Respondents also were given the option of circling not sure, and these responses were excluded from the analyses. For items 14-18 on the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and items 13-17 on the Principal Survey, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agree/disagree with statements about the program using a 5-point scale. Items 19-21 on the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and items 18-20 on Principal Survey followed different formats and will be discussed separately below.

Responses for the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey are summarized in Tables 14 and 15. Table 14 includes items 1-13, rank ordered by the item means from very effective(+2) to very ineffective(-2). As shown in Table 14, all 13 mean ratings were positive, an indication that respondents generally viewed the program as effective rather than ineffective. The program areas that received the highest mean (average) ratings of effectiveness were quality of instruction (item 6), improvement of student reading fluency (item 11), and high expectations for student learning (item 7). All three items received mean ratings of 1.7. Two additional items had mean ratings of 1.6 and one item received a mean rating of 1.5. The program areas that received the lowest mean ratings were parent involvement (item 5), pupil selection (item 8), and coordination with the regular school program (item 1). The mean ratings for these three items were .1, .3, and .6, respectively. The percentages of responses that were very ineffective or ineffective ranged from 26.4% to 20.4% for the three items.

Table 15 contains items 14-18, rank ordered by the item means from strongly agree(+2) to strongly disagree(-2). The mean ratings for all five items were positive, an indication of agreement with the statements that were supportive of the program. The statements that had the highest mean ratings of agreement concerned the continued use of whole language instructional methods (item 17), the value of CLEAR-RR to the school (item 14), and support for funding of CLEAR-RR (item 18). The mean ratings for these items were 1.9, 1.8, and 1.8. The other two items in this section had mean ratings of .5 and received the most responses of strongly disagree or disagree of the items in this section. These two items concerned the noticeable improvement of student attendance (item 15) and student behavior (item 16).

Item 19 asked, "What is your present position in the Reading Recovery Program?" The purpose of this item was to verify that survey respondents were in fact CLEAR-RR teachers and not other staff members or graduate students working with the program. Response options sought for this item were CLEAR-teacher or classroom teacher. These were staffing designations that had been used in the program in previous years and were known by respondents. Of the 54 respondents, 51 circled one or the other of these two staff positions. The remaining 3 respondents circled more than one position and/or wrote in "Reading Recovery" under other. All 54 responses were considered valid.

Item 20 was included in the survey because of the possibility that teacher ratings would vary by the length of teacher experience with the program. Item 20 asked, "Including this year, how many years have you been a Reading Recovery teacher?" Responses indicated that 17 teachers each had 1 year, 17 teachers had 2 years, 14 teachers had 3 years, and 6 teachers each had 4 years with the program.

The mean ratings for the first-year CLEAR-RR teachers and the experienced teachers for items 1-18 were compared. Based on mean ratings, the first-year CLEAR-RR teachers rated the program as more effective than the experienced CLEAR-RR teachers in all of the program areas except teacher-principal cooperation, parent involvement, and pupil scheduling. Teacher-principal

Table 14

CLEAR-RR Staff Survey Responses for Items 1-13
Rank Ordered by Item Mean
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Effective +2 %	(N)	+1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	-1 %	(N)	Very Ineffective -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
6. Quality of instruction	1.7	74.1	(40)	24.1	(13)	1.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(54)
11. Improvement of student reading fluency	1.7	68.5	(37)	31.5	(17)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(54)
7. High teacher expectations for student learning	1.7	72.2	(39)	24.1	(13)	1.9	(1)	1.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	(54)
10. Improvement of student reading comprehension	1.6	61.1	(33)	37.0	(20)	1.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(54)
3. Instuctional leadership by Reading Recovery teacher leaders	1.6	67.9	(36)	22.6	(12)	9.4	(5)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(53)
12. Pupil achievement	1.5	49.1	(26)	47.2	(25)	3.8	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(53)
4. Teacher-Principal cooperation	1.4	60.4	(32)	26.4	(14)	7.5	(4)	3.8	(2)	1.9	(1)	(53)
13. Compatibility with district Course of Study	1.3	44.4	(24)	48.1	(26)	3.7	(2)	0.0	(0)	3.7	(2)	(54)
2. Communication between regular classroom teachers and CLEAR-Reading-Recovery teachers	1.1	31.5	(17)	48.1	(26)	16.7	(9)	3.7	(2)	0.0	(0)	(54)

(table continues)

Table 14 (continued)

CLEAR-RR Staff Survey Responses for Items 1-13
Rank Ordered by Item Mean
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Effective +2 %	(N)	+1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	-1 %	(N)	Very Ineffective -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
9. Pupil scheduling	1.0	37.7	(20)	37.7	(20)	18.9	(10)	0.0	(0)	5.7	(3)	(53)
1. Coordination with the regular school program	.6	25.9	(14)	33.3	(18)	20.4	(11)	14.8	(8)	5.6	(3)	(54)
8. Pupil selection	.3	17.0	(9)	37.7	(20)	18.9	(10)	15.1	(8)	11.3	(6)	(53)
5. Parent involvement	.1	3.7	(2)	31.5	(17)	44.4	(24)	11.1	(6)	9.3	(5)	(54)

Note. Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

Table 15

CLEAR-RR Staff Survey Responses for Items 14-18
Rank Ordered by Item Mean
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Strongly Agree +2 %	(N)	Agree +1 %	(N)	Undecided 0 %	(N)	Disagree -1 %	(N)	Strongly Disagree -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
17. If I were a regular classroom teacher not affiliated with the Reading Recovery Program, I would continue to use whole language instructional methods (e.g., many opportunities to read and write in context) in my classroom.	1.9	92.6	(50)	7.4	(4)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(54)
14. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school.	1.8	87.0	(47)	11.1	(6)	0.0	(0)	1.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	(54)
18. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program.	1.8	83.3	(45)	13.0	(7)	1.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	1.9	(1)	(54)
16. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student behavior.	.5	15.1	(8)	39.6	(21)	30.2	(16)	15.1	(8)	0.0	(0)	(53)
15. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student attendance.	.5	15.1	(8)	30.2	(16)	41.5	(22)	13.2	(7)	0.0	(0)	(53)

cooperation (item 4) had the largest difference between the mean ratings of the two groups (an absolute value of .5), with a mean rating of 1.1 for first-year teachers, and 1.6 for experienced teachers. For items 14-18, the first-year teachers had higher mean ratings of agreement than the experienced teachers except for the item about the use of whole language instructional methods. Caution should be taken in interpreting differences in mean item ratings based on teacher experience with the program as the ratings are based on small numbers of teachers and ratings may have been affected by responses from only one or two teachers.

Item 21 asked, "How many pupils have you served in Reading Recovery this year? The mean number of pupils reported served by each teacher was 6.7 pupils.

Comments received for item 22 are included in Appendix G. The comments included the topics of: (a) pupil selection, (b) pupils who make little progress, (c) teacher inservice to carry over to the classroom, and (d) the difficulty of being a half-time program teacher. For pupil selection, it was suggested that the diagnostic tests be used instead of the Metropolitan or CTBS, that better procedures were needed to identify the pupils with potential to be average and the pupils who are developmentally handicapped (DH), and that pupils with higher scores be served first while those with lower scores mature and review. If pupils make little or no progress after a designated number of lessons, it was suggested that they be dropped from the program so that other pupils could be served. Reading Recovery inservice workshops for all first, second, and third grade teachers were suggested as a means of providing CLEAR-RR pupils with support and carry over in the classroom. Another suggestion was to give booster lessons in the fall to previous CLEAR-RR pupils. Finally, it was suggested that CLEAR-RR teachers continue to serve half-time in the CLEAR-RR Program but also serve half-time in the Regular CLEAR Program (instead of half-time in the classroom), or else serve full-time in the CLEAR-RR Program.

Responses for the Principal Survey are summarized in Tables 16 and 17. Table 16 includes items 1-12, rank ordered by the item means from very effective to very ineffective. All 12 mean ratings were positive, an indication that principals generally viewed the program as effective. Moreover, only one program area, parent involvement, received any ratings of very ineffective or ineffective. The program areas that received the highest mean ratings of effectiveness were compatibility with district Course of Study (item 12), high teacher expectations for student learning (item 6), and teacher-principal cooperation (item 3). All three items received mean ratings of 1.7. As shown in Table 16, three additional items had mean ratings of 1.6 and four items had mean ratings of 1.5. The program areas that received the lowest mean ratings were parent involvement (item 4), pupil selection (item 7), and pupil achievement (item 11). The mean ratings for these three items were .9, 1.2, and 1.4.

Table 17 includes items 13-17, rank ordered by the item means from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The mean ratings for all five items were positive, an indication of agreement with the statements that were supportive of the program. The statements that had the highest mean ratings of agreement concerned the continued use of whole language instructional methods (item 16), the value of CLEAR-RR to the school (item 13), and support

Principal Survey Responses for Items 1-12
Rank Ordered by Item Mean
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Effective +2 %	(N)	+1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	-1 %	(N)	Very Ineffective -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
12. Compatibility with district Course of Study	1.7	70.0	(14)	30.0	(6)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(20)
6. High teacher expectations for student learning	1.7	73.7	(14)	21.1	(4)	5.3	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
3. Teacher-Principal cooperation	1.7	70.0	(14)	25.0	(5)	5.0	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(20)
5. Quality of instruction	1.6	73.7	(14)	15.8	(3)	10.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
10. Improvement of student reading fluency	1.6	63.2	(12)	31.6	(6)	5.3	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
8. Pupil scheduling	1.5	52.6	(10)	47.4	(9)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
1. Coordination with the regular school program	1.5	60.0	(12)	30.0	(6)	10.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(20)
2. Communication between regular classroom teachers and CLEAR-Reading-Recovery teachers	1.5	57.9	(11)	31.6	(6)	10.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
9. Improvement of student reading comprehension	1.5	57.9	(11)	31.6	(6)	10.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
11. Pupil achievement	1.4	52.6	(10)	36.8	(7)	10.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
7. Pupil selection	1.2	26.3	(5)	68.4	(13)	5.3	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(19)
4. Parent involvement	.9	30.0	(6)	50.0	(10)	0.0	(0)	20.0	(4)	0.0	(0)	(20)

Note. Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88

Table 17

Principal Survey Responses for Items 13-17
Rank Ordered by Item Mean
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Strongly Agree +2 %	(N)	Agree +1 %	(N)	Undecided 0 %	(N)	Disagree -1 %	(N)	Strongly Disagree -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
16. I would encourage the use of whole language instructional methods (e.g., Many opportunities to read and write in context) in regular classrooms in my school.	1.8	81.8	(18)	18.2	(4)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(22)
13. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school.	1.8	86.4	(19)	9.1	(2)	4.5	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(22)
17. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program.	1.7	81.8	(18)	9.1	(2)	9.1	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(22)
Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student behavior.	1.0	36.4	(8)	31.8	(7)	22.7	(5)	9.1	(2)	0.0	(0)	(22)
14. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student attendance.	.9	36.4	(8)	27.3	(6)	27.3	(6)	9.1	(2)	0.0	(0)	(22)

for funding of CLEAR-RR (item 17). The mean ratings for these items were 1.8, 1.8, and 1.7, respectively. The other two items in this section concerned the noticeable improvement of student attendance (item 14) and student behavior (item 15). These items had mean ratings of .9 and 1.0, respectively. Items 14 and 15 were the only items in this section that received any ratings of disagreement.

Items 18-20 were included in the Principal Survey to collect information needed by the Reading Recovery teacher leaders for a specific report. The responses for these items are discussed briefly here but they are appended to this report with the comments received for item 21 (see Appendix H). For item 18, a majority of the 22 principals reported no concerns about implementation or left the item blank. Some of the other responses included the desire to continue the program, to expand the program, and to place children who may qualify for developmentally handicapped (DH) programs on a waiting list so that other children might be served first. For items 19 and 20, a majority of the principals reported that teachers and parents had positive comments about the CLEAR-RR Program. Comments for item 21 included "very pleased," "proven program that works," and "This program provides the best, most direct and effective early intervention instruction I have seen!"

Because the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and Principal Survey contained 17 items in common, it was possible to compare the survey results. The only difference between the scale items, (in the first two sections) of the surveys was that the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey included an item about teacher leaders (item 3) but the Principal Survey did not. Excluding this one item, comparisons of the program effectiveness items indicated that, in all 12 areas, both groups generally viewed the program as effective rather than ineffective. The parent involvement and pupil selection items received the lowest mean ratings from both groups.

The biggest differences between the program effectiveness ratings for the two groups were for the items about coordination with the regular school program, pupil selection, and parent involvement. For all of these items, the principals' mean ratings were .8 to .9 of a point higher than the CLEAR-RR teachers' mean ratings.

For the agree-disagree items, all of the mean ratings for CLEAR-RR teachers and principals were positive, an indication that both groups generally agreed with the five statements that were supportive of the program. A comparison of Tables 15 and 17 showed that the rank orders of these items for the two groups were exactly the same.

Classroom Teacher Survey

The Classroom Teacher Survey was distributed to teachers of specified homerooms. Each instrument sent to a classroom teacher contained the name(s) of one or more pupils in the homeroom who were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR treatment group and who were still enrolled in the Columbus Public Schools at the time of the mailing. Of the 208 pupils in the 1986-87 treatment group, 191 were still enrolled. Of these, 173 were in the 1986-87 evaluation sample.

The return rate for the survey was 71.8% (94 usable surveys returned out of 131 mailed). The 94 responses to the Classroom Teacher Survey contained the names and student numbers of 137 (71.7%) of the 191 pupils for whom ratings were sought. Of the 137 pupils, 30 pupils were excluded from the analysis due to one or more of the following reasons: the pupil was no longer in the homeroom, the pupil was in special education, the teacher felt the pupil had not been in the homeroom long enough for him or her to provide ratings, the pupil's grade level was missing from the survey. Thirteen more pupils were excluded from the analysis because they were not in the evaluation sample. The final analysis was conducted for the remaining 94 pupils. This number was 49.7% of the 189 pupils who were in the 1986-87 evaluation sample.

Classroom Teacher Survey responses are summarized in Tables 18-23. Of the 94 pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample who were included in the final analysis, 21.3% (20 pupils) were retained in grade 1 and 78.7% (74 pupils) were in grade 2 in 1987-88. Almost two-thirds of the group, 64.9% (61 pupils), were discontinued in 1986-87 and one-third, 35.1% (33 pupils), were not discontinued. The 64.9% discontinued was within .7% of the percentage (65.6%) discontinued in the entire 1986-87 evaluation sample.

All 61 of the pupils who were discontinued were in grade 2. Of the 33 pupils who were not discontinued, 60.6% (20 pupils) were in grade 1 and 39.4% (13 pupils) were in grade 2. Viewed within grade level, in grade 1, none of the pupils were discontinued; in grade 2, 82.4% of the pupils were discontinued and 17.6% were not discontinued.

Table 18 includes a distribution of pupil ratings for items 3-13, rank ordered by the item means from very successful (+2) to very unsuccessful (-2), and reported by grade level. The ratings for pupils who were retained in grade 1 and pupils who progressed to grade 2 were analyzed separately to take into account the different teacher expectations for pupil performance for these two groups.

Table 19 includes a distribution of grade 2 pupil ratings for items 3-13, by 1986-87 pupil category. That is, ratings for pupils who were discontinued during 1986-87 are reported separately from ratings for pupils who were not discontinued but received 60 or more lessons. Items in Table 19, like Table 18, are rank ordered by the item means. A positive mean rating indicates successful performance and a negative mean rating indicates unsuccessful performance. In addition to item means, the percentages of positive ratings (very successful and successful) and negative ratings (very unsuccessful and unsuccessful) were considered.

Four items about reading were of particular interest: reads and understands basal reading stories (item 3), reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction (item 4), makes progress in reading group (item 11) and usually knows how to figure out new words (item 12).

Results for Items 3-13 in Grades 1 and 2 (see Table 18). Overall, on items 3-13, grade 1 pupils received four "successful" (positive) mean ratings, four "unsuccessful" (negative) mean ratings, and three ratings in between. Grade 2 pupils received seven successful mean ratings, one

Table 18

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 3-13
for 1987-88 Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Rank Ordered by Item Mean by 1987-88 Grade Level

Grade 1 Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Successful +2 %	(N)	Successful +1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	Unsuccessful -1 %	(N)	Very Unsuccessful -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
13. Attends class regularly	.9	40.0	(8)	35.0	(7)	5.0	(1)	15.0	(3)	5.0	(1)	(20)
6. Understands assignments	.4	5.0	(1)	40.0	(8)	40.0	(8)	15.0	(3)	0.0	(0)	(20)
7. Works independently	.2	5.0	(1)	45.0	(9)	25.0	(5)	15.0	(3)	10.0	(2)	(20)
11. Makes progress in reading group	.1	0.0	(0)	50.0	(10)	20.0	(4)	20.0	(4)	10.0	(2)	(20)
8. Finishes seatwork	.0	5.0	(1)	45.0	(9)	25.0	(5)	0.0	(0)	25.0	(5)	(20)
5. Reads library books	.0	10.0	(2)	35.0	(7)	20.0	(4)	20.0	(4)	15.0	(3)	(20)
4. Reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction	.0	5.0	(1)	30.0	(6)	35.0	(7)	15.0	(3)	15.0	(3)	(20)
3. Reads and understands basal reading stories	-.2	0.0	(0)	35.0	(7)	30.0	(6)	20.0	(4)	15.0	(3)	(20)
9. Practices self control	-.2	10.0	(2)	30.0	(6)	15.0	(3)	25.0	(5)	20.0	(4)	(20)
10. Writes own stories	-.2	0.0	(0)	40.0	(8)	20.0	(4)	20.0	(4)	20.0	(4)	(20)
12. Usually knows how to figure out new words	-.6	0.0	(0)	15.0	(3)	35.0	(7)	25.0	(5)	25.0	(5)	(20)

(table continues)

Table 18 (continued)

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 3-13
for 1987-88 Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Rank Ordered by Item Mean by 1987-88 Grade Level

Grade 2 Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Successful +2 %	(N)	Successful +1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	Unsuccessful -1 %	(N)	Very Unsuccessful -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
13. Attends class regularly	1.4	56.2	(41)	31.5	(23)	6.8	(5)	4.1	(3)	1.4	(1)	(73)
11. Makes progress in reading group	.5	9.5	(7)	52.7	(39)	20.3	(15)	10.8	(8)	6.8	(5)	(74)
5. Reads library books	.5	12.2	(9)	41.9	(31)	32.4	(24)	8.1	(6)	5.4	(4)	(74)
3. Reads and understands basal reading stories	.5	12.2	(9)	45.9	(34)	23.0	(17)	14.9	(11)	4.1	(3)	(74)
6. Understands assignments	.2	9.5	(7)	39.2	(29)	24.3	(18)	20.3	(15)	6.8	(5)	(74)
4. Reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction	.2	9.5	(7)	36.5	(27)	29.7	(22)	14.9	(11)	9.5	(7)	(74)
12. Usually knows how to figure out new words	.1	9.5	(7)	31.1	(23)	31.1	(23)	13.5	(10)	14.9	(11)	(74)
7. Works independently	.0	9.5	(7)	32.4	(24)	21.6	(16)	20.3	(15)	16.2	(12)	(74)
9. Practices self control	.0	16.2	(12)	27.0	(20)	20.3	(15)	12.2	(9)	24.3	(18)	(74)
8. Finishes seatwork	.0	13.5	(10)	25.7	(19)	20.3	(15)	24.3	(18)	16.2	(12)	(74)
10. Writes own stories	-.1	4.1	(3)	31.1	(23)	28.4	(21)	20.3	(15)	16.2	(12)	(74)

Table 19

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 3-13
for 1987-88 Second Grade Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Rank Ordered by Item Mean by Pupil Category
1987-88

Discontinued Pupils Item	Mean	Response Category: Very Successful +2 %	(N)	Successful +1 %	(N)	In Between 0 %	(N)	Unsuccessful -1 %	(N)	Very Unsuccessful -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
13. Attends class regularly	1.4	56.7	(34)	35.0	(21)	5.0	(3)	1.7	(1)	1.7	(1)	(60)
5. Reads library books	.6	14.8	(9)	44.3	(27)	32.8	(20)	4.9	(3)	3.3	(2)	(61)
11. Makes progress in reading group	.6	11.5	(7)	57.4	(35)	18.0	(11)	8.2	(5)	4.9	(3)	(61)
3. Reads and understands basal reading stories	.6	14.8	(9)	49.2	(30)	21.3	(13)	13.1	(8)	1.6	(1)	(61)
4. Reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction	.4	11.5	(7)	41.0	(25)	29.5	(18)	11.5	(7)	6.6	(4)	(61)
6. Understands assignments	.4	11.5	(7)	42.6	(26)	23.0	(14)	18.0	(11)	4.9	(3)	(61)
9. Practices self control	.2	19.7	(12)	31.1	(19)	19.7	(12)	9.8	(6)	19.7	(12)	(61)
7. Works independently	.2	11.5	(7)	36.1	(22)	23.0	(14)	18.0	(11)	11.5	(7)	(61)
12. Usually knows how to figure out new words	.2	9.8	(6)	36.1	(22)	31.1	(19)	8.2	(5)	14.8	(9)	(61)
8. Finishes seatwork	.1	16.4	(10)	26.2	(16)	21.3	(13)	21.3	(13)	14.8	(9)	(61)
10. Writes own stories	.0	4.9	(3)	32.8	(20)	32.8	(20)	21.3	(13)	8.2	(5)	(61)

(table continues)

Table 19 (continued)

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 3-13
for 1987-88 Second Grade Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
Rank Ordered by Item Mean by Pupil Category
1987-88

Not Discontinued Pupils			Response Category										
			Very Successful +2		Successful +1		In Between 0		Unsuccessful -1		Very Unsuccessful -2		Total
	Item	Mean	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)
13.	Attends class regularly	1.1	53.8	(7)	15.4	(2)	15.4	(2)	15.4	(2)	0.0	(0)	(13)
5.	Reads library books	-.2	0.0	(0)	30.8	(4)	30.8	(4)	23.1	(3)	15.4	(2)	(13)
3.	Reads and understands basal reading stories	-.2	0.0	(0)	30.8	(4)	30.8	(4)	23.1	(3)	15.4	(2)	(13)
11.	Makes progress in reading group	-.2	0.0	(0)	30.8	(4)	30.8	(4)	23.1	(3)	15.4	(2)	(13)
6.	Understands assignments	-.4	0.0	(0)	23.1	(3)	30.8	(4)	30.8	(4)	15.4	(2)	(13)
12.	Usually knows how to figure out new words	-.5	7.7	(1)	7.7	(1)	30.8	(4)	38.5	(5)	15.4	(2)	(13)
4.	Reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction	-.6	0.0	(0)	15.4	(2)	30.8	(4)	30.8	(4)	23.1	(3)	(13)
8.	Finishes seatwork	-.6	0.0	(0)	23.1	(3)	15.4	(2)	38.5	(5)	23.1	(3)	(13)
7.	Works independently	-.9	0.0	(0)	15.4	(2)	15.4	(2)	30.8	(4)	38.5	(5)	(13)
10.	Writes own stories	-1.0	0.0	(0)	23.1	(3)	7.7	(1)	15.4	(2)	53.8	(7)	(13)
9.	Practices self control	-1.1	0.0	(0)	7.7	(1)	23.1	(3)	23.1	(3)	46.2	(6)	(13)

unsuccessful mean rating, and three mean ratings in between. For grade 1, the item about reading group progress had the highest mean rating (.1) of the four reading items (items 3, 4, 11, and 12), 50.0% of these ratings were successful (positive), and 30.0% were unsuccessful (negative). How to figure out new words had the lowest mean rating (-.6) of the four reading items, 15.0% of these ratings were successful (positive), and 50.0% were unsuccessful (negative). For grade 2, the items about reading group progress and understanding basal stories each had the highest mean rating (.5) of the four reading items, 58.1% to 62.2% of these ratings were successful (positive), and 17.6% to 19.0% of the ratings were unsuccessful (negative). How to figure out new words had the lowest mean rating (.1) of the four reading items, 40.6% of the ratings were successful (positive), and 28.4% were unsuccessful (negative). For items 3-13, pupils in both grades 1 and 2 received their highest mean rating for class attendance (item 13). Grade 1 pupils received their lowest mean rating (-.6) for how to figure out new words. Grade 2 pupils received their lowest mean rating (-.1) for writes own stories.

Results for Items 3-13 by Pupil Category Within Grade 2 (see Table 19). Overall, on items 3-13, discontinued pupils received 10 "successful" (positive) mean ratings and one mean rating in between "successful" and "unsuccessful". By contrast, not discontinued pupils received only one successful mean rating and 10 unsuccessful mean ratings. For discontinued pupils and not discontinued pupils, the items about reading group progress and understanding basal stories each had the highest mean rating of the four reading items (items 3, 4, 11, and 12). For discontinued pupils, the mean rating for each of these items was .6, 64.0% to 68.9% of these ratings were successful (positive) and 13.1% to 14.7% of the ratings were unsuccessful (negative). For not discontinued pupils, the mean rating for each of these items was -.2, 30.8% of the ratings were successful (positive), and 38.5% were unsuccessful (negative). For discontinued pupils, how to figure out new words had the lowest mean rating (.2) of the four reading items, 47.9% of the ratings were successful (positive), and 23.0% were unsuccessful (negative). For not discontinued pupils, the item about supplemental materials had the lowest mean rating (-.6) of the reading items, 15.4% of the ratings were successful (positive), and 53.9% were unsuccessful (negative). For items 3-13, discontinued and not discontinued pupils received their highest mean rating for class attendance. Discontinued pupils received their lowest mean rating (.0) for writes own stories. Not discontinued pupils received their lowest mean rating (-1.1) for self-control.

Tables 20 and 21 show distributions of pupil ratings for the three items about the achievement of passing scores on basal tests (items 14-16) and the retention item (item 19). The ratings are reported by grade level in Table 20 and by pupil category for grade 2 pupils in Table 21. Of particular interest, for comprehension, 45.0% (9) of the grade 1 pupils and 64.3% (45) of the grade 2 pupil's achieved passing scores. Within grade 2, 71.9% (41) of the discontinued pupils and 30.8% (4) of the not discontinued pupils achieved passing scores in comprehension.

Based on item 17, (reading group status) the breakdown for pupils in the reading groups was as follows: for grade 1, 5.6% (1 pupil) in the high group, 66.7% (12 pupils) in the middle group, and 27.8% (5 pupils) in the low group; for grade 2, 5.4% (4 pupils) in the high group, 39.2% (29 pupils) in

the middle group, and 55.4% (41 pupils) in the low group. By pupil category within grade 2, the percentages of discontinued pupils in the high and middle groups were higher than the percentages of not discontinued pupils in these groups. For discontinued pupils the percentages were: 6.6% (4 pupils) in the high group, 44.3% (27 pupils) in the middle group, and 49.2% (30 pupils) in the low group. For not discontinued pupils the percentages were: no pupils in the high group, 15.4% (2 pupils) in the middle group, and 84.6% (11 pupils) in the low group.

Table 22 shows a distribution of letter grades earned in reading in the last grading period (item 18). No pupils retained in grade 1 earned an A, but 2.9% of the pupils in grade 2 earned an A. The percentages of pupils who earned an E were 5.3% for grade 1, and 13.0% for grade 2. Within grade 2, all 11 of the A and B grades were earned by discontinued pupils. The percentage of grade 2 pupils who earned a grade of C or above was greater for discontinued pupils than for not discontinued pupils -- 71.5% compared to 15.4%.

For item 19, classroom teachers reported that none of the pupils in grade 1 (i.e., those retained in 1987-88) would be retained in 1988-89, however, this occurrence may be explained by the district practice of not retaining pupils more than once in the primary grades. The teachers also reported that 15.7% (11) of the 70 pupils in grade 2 would be retained. Within grade 2, 12.3% (7) of the 57 discontinued pupils would be retained, compared to 30.8% (4) of the 13 not discontinued pupils. For item 20, 65.7% (44) of the classroom teachers responded yes, the CLEAR-RR Program was serving his or her school in 1987-88, and 34.3% (23) responded no.

Table 23 shows a distribution of responses to items 21 and 22, the two items about the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program, rank ordered by the item means from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Item 21 is about the value of the program. Item 22 concerns support for funding of the program. For both items the mean ratings indicated agreement rather than disagreement with the two statements that were supportive of the program. Nevertheless, caution is advised when interpreting the ratings for items 21 and 22. Based on comments received from respondents, it seems that some classroom teachers may have confused the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program with the CLEAR-Elementary Program, the CLEAR-Elementary-CAI Program, or the entire CLEAR Component of Chapter 1 programs. Thus, classroom teachers may have been more or less supportive of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program than the ratings indicated.

Item 23 asked about grade levels taught by respondents. The distribution of grade levels taught was as follows: 27.9% (12) taught grade 1, 2.3% (1) taught grades 1-2 split, 58.1% (25) taught grade 2, 7.0% (3) taught grades 2-3 split, and 4.7% (2) taught another arrangement.

Comments received for item 24 are included in Appendix I. The comments included the topics of: (a) the need for serving pupils in reading in grade 2 as well as in grade 1, (b) pupil selection issues, particularly those related to pupils in Special Education and English as a Second Language (ESL), and (c) the apparent confusion of respondents with regard to the various programs that comprised the CLEAR Component. Reading assistance for pupils in grade 2 was advocated for reasons such as continuity, follow-up, and remediation. The selection of Special Education pupils was questioned.

Table 20

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 14, 15, 16, and 19
for 1987-88 Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by 1987-88 Grade Level

Item	Grade									
	Grade 1					Grade 2				
	Yes		No		Total	Yes		No		Total
	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)
Achieves suggested passing score on basal tests in the area of:										
14. Comprehension	45.0	(9)	55.0	(11)	(20)	64.3	(45)	35.7	(25)	(70)
15. Vocabulary	85.0	(17)	15.0	(3)	(20)	81.2	(56)	18.8	(13)	(69)
16. Decoding	26.3	(5)	73.7	(14)	(19)	42.0	(29)	58.0	(40)	(69)
19. Will be retained at the end of this school year	0.0	(0)	100.0	(20)	(20)	15.7	(11)	84.3	(59)	(70)

Note. Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

Table 21

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Items 14, 15, 16, and 19
for 1987-88 Second Grade Pupils Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Pupil Category
1987-88

Item	Grade 2 Pupil Category									
	Discontinued					Not Discontinued				
	Yes		No		Total	Yes		No		Total
	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)
Achieves suggested passing score on basal tests in the area of:										
14. Comprehension	71.9	(41)	28.1	(16)	(57)	30.8	(4)	69.2	(9)	(13)
15. Vocabulary	83.9	(47)	16.1	(9)	(56)	69.2	(9)	30.8	(4)	(13)
16. Decoding	47.4	(27)	52.6	(30)	(57)	16.7	(2)	83.3	(10)	(12)
19. Will be retained at the end of this school year	12.3	(7)	87.7	(50)	(57)	30.8	(4)	69.2	(9)	(13)

Note. Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

Table 22

Classroom Teacher Survey Ratings for Item 18 for 1987-88 Pupils
Who Were in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
1987-88

Item	Grade Level							
	Grade 1		Grade 2					
			Discontinued		Not Discontinued		Total	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
18. Earned the following letter grade in reading in the last grading period (Circle NA=Not Applicable if pupil was not enrolled)								
A	0.0	(0)	3.6	(2)	0.0	(0)	2.9	(2)
B	21.1	(4)	16.1	(9)	0.0	(0)	13.0	(9)
C	42.1	(8)	51.8	(29)	15.4	(2)	44.9	(31)
D	31.6	(6)	19.6	(11)	53.8	(7)	26.1	(18)
E	5.3	(1)	8.9	(5)	30.8	(4)	13.0	(9)
Total	100.0	(19)	100.0	(56)	100.0	(13)	100.0	(69)

Note. Responses of Not Applicable were excluded from the analysis.

Table 23

Classroom Teacher Survey Responses for Items 21-22
from Teachers in Schools Served by CLEAR-Reading Recovery
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Strongly Agree +2 %	(N)	Agree +1 %	(N)	Undecided 0 %	(N)	Disagree -1 %	(N)	Strongly Disagree -2 %	(N)	Total (N)
21. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school.	1.4	58.5	(24)	24.4	(10)	14.6	(6)	2.4	(1)	0.0	(0)	(41)
22. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program.	1.3	51.2	(21)	31.7	(13)	12.2	(5)	4.9	(2)	0.0	(0)	(41)

. Responses of Don't Know were excluded from the analysis. Some respondents may have confused the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program with other program(s) in the Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading (CLEAR) Component.

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

Question 6 What were the attitudes toward Reading Recovery of parents of pupils participating in the program?

Analysis 6.1 Frequency counts, percents, and content analysis of the survey of parents of pupils in CLEAR-RR during 1987-88 (Parent Survey).

The CLEAR-RR Parent Survey was mailed in May 1988 to the parents of pupils who were enrolled in the program prior to March 15, 1988 and who were enrolled in the school district at the time of the mailing. Included in the mailing were parents of pupils who had been discontinued, pupils who had been served but left the program before they were discontinued, and pupils who were still enrolled in the program. The purposes of the CLEAR-RR Parent Survey were to obtain the parents' perceptions of their children's reading and writing skills and also of the CLEAR-RR Program specifically, to find out the number of contacts that parents had with the program, and to collect parent comments about the program in general (see Appendix F). The return rate for the survey was 25.6%, (81 usable surveys returned out of 312 mailed). Because of the low return rate, respondents may not be representative of the entire group of program parents.

Tables 24-26 contain data from the CLEAR-RR Parent Survey. Parents were asked to respond to items 1-8 and 10-16 by circling yes, no, or not sure. For the analysis, yes responses were given a value of 2, and no responses were given a value of 1. Not sure responses were excluded. Thus, the number (N) of parents responding to each item can vary.

As indicated in Table 24, the mean ratings for items 1-8 ranged from 2.0 to 1.6. Included in this section were three items about the child's reading (items 1, 3, and 5) and three similar items about the child's writing (items 2, 4, and 6). For each pair of reading-writing items, the item about reading received a higher mean rating than the item about writing. That is, a greater percentage of parents were concerned that their children would have trouble learning to read than were concerned that they would have trouble learning to write, a greater percentage were satisfied with their children's reading progress than were satisfied with their writing ability, and a greater percentage often helped their children to read at home than helped them to write. For item 8, 87.5% (56 parents) answered yes, "My child feels successful in school this year," and 12.5% (8 parents) answered no. The number of parents who responded not sure to items 1-8 ranged from 1 (item 5) to 20 parents (item 4).

Further analyses of the response patterns for certain combinations of reading-writing items (items 1-6) showed that a majority (37) of the 54 parents who responded to items 1 and 2 were concerned that their children would have trouble learning to read and write, 12 parents were not concerned about either one, and only 5 parents were concerned about one subject but not the other. About half (38) of the 75 parents who responded to items 5 and 6 often help their children to both read and write, but 24 parents often help their children to read only.

Item 9 stated, "Before getting this survey, I knew that my child was in the Reading Recovery Program." Of the 75 parents who responded to this item, 92.0% (69 parents) answered yes and 8.0% (6 parents) answered no. Not sure

Table 24

Parent Survey Responses for Items 1-8
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Yes 2 %	Yes 2 (N)	No 1 %	No 1 (N)	Total (N)
1. At the beginning of the year I was concerned that my child would have trouble learning to read.	1.8	77.5	(55)	22.5	(16)	(71)
2. At the beginning of the year I was concerned that my child would have trouble learning to write his or her own stories.	1.7	69.6	(48)	30.4	(21)	(69)
3. I am satisfied with my child's reading progress in first grade.	1.9	91.2	(62)	8.8	(6)	(68)
4. I am satisfied with my child's ability to write his or her own stories in first grade.	1.8	83.1	(49)	16.9	(10)	(59)
5. I often help my child to read books at home.	2.0	96.2	(76)	3.8	(3)	(79)
6. I often help my child to write his or her own stories at home.	1.6	60.3	(44)	39.7	(29)	(73)
7. When my child sees a new word, he/she usually knows how to figure it out.	1.7	70.8	(46)	29.2	(19)	(65)
8. My child feels successful in school this year.	1.9	87.5	(56)	12.5	(8)	(64)

Note. Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

was not a response option for item 9. Because specific knowledge of the CLEAR-RR Program was required to answer items 10-19, parents who responded no to item 9 were instructed to skip these items. Any responses to items 10-19 that were given by those who answered no to item 9 were excluded from the analysis.

Table 25 includes items 10-16. The mean ratings for these items ranged from 2.0 to 1.9. That is, most parents answered yes to items 10-16, indicating that they were glad their children were in the program, they felt welcome to visit, the program helped their children, their children enjoyed the program, and so forth. The percentages of respondents who answered yes to items 10-16 ranged from 98.5% to 90.9%.

Included in this section was one pair of reading-writing items. As with the previous pairs of similar items, the reading item (item 12) received a higher mean rating than the writing item (item 13). The percentage of parents who indicated that the CLEAR-RR teacher had helped their child to improve in reading was 98.5%, compared to 90.9% for the writing item. Also included in this section was the statement, "The Reading Recovery teacher has let me know how to help my child at home" (item 14). For this item, 90.9% (60 parents) responded yes. The number of parents who responded not sure to items 10-16 ranged from 1 (item 10) to 14 parents (item 13). As in the previous section of the survey, the item that received the most not sure responses concerned writing.

Table 26 contains a summary of information from items 17-19, items that focus on the number of parent contacts with the CLEAR-RR Program. Responses indicated that on the average, the CLEAR-RR teachers contacted parents during the 1987-88 school year more frequently (2.3 times) than the parents contacted the CLEAR-RR teachers (1.3 times). The mean number of contacts regardless of the initiating party (item 17 plus item 18) was 3.5. The most contacts of each type were: 12 teacher-initiated, 6 parent-initiated, and 17 total contacts. The percentages of parents who reported one or more contacts were 85.2%, 63.3%, and 90.3%, respectively. Thus, the percentages of parents who reported no contacts were 14.8%, 36.7%, and 9.7%, respectively. The percentage of parents who indicated that they had visited the CLEAR-RR teacher was 72.1%. It should be noted that 5 responses to item 17, 4 responses to item 18, and 2 responses to item 19 were excluded from this analysis because the parents did not give specific numbers of contacts. These responses included "almost daily," "every week," "numerous," "more than one," and "when I pick up my child." Thus, the actual parent contact with the program may have been underreported.

Item 20 was included in the survey to collect information that the teacher leaders needed for a report. This item asked parents to rate the CLEAR-RR program on a 5-point scale from very ineffective (-2) to very effective (+2). Responses of not sure were excluded from the analysis. The mean response to item 20 was 1.3, indicating positive perceptions of the program's effectiveness. The ratings for the 74 parents who responded on the 5-point scale gave the following ratings: 73.0% (54) very effective, 81% (6) effective, 6.8% (5) in between, 1.4% (1) effective, and 10.8% (8) very ineffective. Six parents were not sure.

Table 25

Parent Survey Responses for Items 10-16
1987-88

Item	Mean	Response Category: Yes 2 %	Yes 2 (N)	No 1 %	No 1 (N)	Total (N)
10. The Reading Recovery teacher has explained to me why my child is in the program.	1.9	94.1	(64)	5.9	(4)	(68)
11. I am glad my child has been in the Reading Recovery program.	2.0	98.5	(66)	1.5	(1)	(67)
12. The Reading Recovery teacher has helped my child to improve in reading.	2.0	98.5	(65)	1.5	(1)	(66)
13. The Reading Recovery teacher has helped my child to improve in writing his or her own stories.	1.9	90.9	(50)	9.1	(5)	(55)
14. The Reading Recovery teacher has let me know how to help my child at home.	1.9	90.9	(60)	9.1	(6)	(66)
15. My child has said that he or she has enjoyed being in the Reading Recovery program.	2.0	96.9	(63)	3.1	(2)	(65)
16. I feel welcome to visit my child's Reading Recovery teacher.	2.0	98.4	(62)	1.6	(1)	(63)

Note. Responses from parents who answered no to item 9 and respones of not sure were excluded from the analysis.

Table 26

Parent Survey Responses for Items 17-19
Concerning Program Contacts and Visits
1987-88

Item	Mean	Number of Times: 0 %	0 (N)	1 %	1 (N)	2-3 %	2-3 (N)	4-5 %	4-5 (N)	6+[a] %	6+[a] (N)	Total (N)
The number of times during this school year that:												
17. The Reading Recovery teacher has contacted me is:	2.3	14.8	(9)	21.3	(13)	47.5	(29)	11.5	(7)	4.9	(3)	(61)
18. I have contacted the Reading Recovery teacher is:	1.3	36.7	(22)	31.7	(19)	25.0	(15)	5.0	(3)	1.7	(1)	(60)
(The total number of contacts for Items 17+18:)	3.5	9.7	(6)	12.9	(8)	32.3	(20)	27.4	(17)	17.7	(11)	(62)
19. I have visited my child's Reading Recovery teacher is:	1.5	27.9	(17)	24.6	(15)	37.7	(23)	8.2	(5)	1.6	(1)	(61)

[a]The maximum responses given were: 12 contacts (item 17), 6 contacts (item 18), 17 contacts (items 17 + 18), and 8 visits (item 19).

Comments received for item 21 are included in Appendix J. Because of the low return rate, respondents may not be representative of the entire group of Program Parents. Two major themes were: (a) that parents were very pleased with the program and thought it really helped their children and (b) they suggested that the program be expanded to other grade levels. Two sample comments were, "I am very happy with this program. At the start of the year my son didn't know the ABC now he is reading. It has been a great help" and "I think the program is terrific (sic) it has helped my little girl read. She comes home and reads to me her stories!"

Question 7 What were the costs of CLEAR-RR compared to other compensatory programs?

Analysis 7.1 Cost per pupil of each program.

Analysis 7.2 NCE gain in reading for each program.

Analysis 7.3 Cost of gain of 1.0 NCE point for each program.

Due to the fact that almost all CLEAR-RR pupils were also served by the Instructional Aide Program, it was not possible to carry out Analyses 7.2 and 7.3 as planned (see the narrative for Question 4 regarding pupil participation in more than one program).

It was possible to make the cost comparisons shown in Table 27. In an attempt to get comparable subgroups, non-public pupils were dropped from the analyses. This resulted in only 38 first-grade pupils in the Regular CLEAR subgroup. A review of the program service for these 38 pupils revealed that this was an atypical group. The percentage of pupils who were served and were included in the evaluation sample was considerably lower than in previous years and it was lower than for the entire Regular CLEAR Program (grades 1-5) for the 1987-88 school year. In an attempt to provide a more comparable subgroup for Regular CLEAR, data for all elementary pupils (grades 1-5) in the Regular CLEAR Program were included in Table 27.

The data in Table 27 indicate that in 1987-88 it cost an average of $2,864 to serve a pupil in Reading Recovery compared to $1,022 in Regular CLEAR (grade 1), $626 in the Instructional Aide Program, and $1,001 in the Regular CLEAR Program (grades 1-5). Of the programs listed in Table 27, CLEAR-RR had the highest percentage of pupils served who met the criteria for the program evaluation sample. These criteria, however, differed among the programs, e.g., CLEAR-RR used the number of lessons while Regular CLEAR used attendance.

Table 27

Cost Analysis for First-Grade Public School Pupils in
Chapter 1 CLEAR Reading Recovery, Chapter 1 Regular CLEAR, and
the DPPF First-Grade Instructional Aide Program
1987-88

Program	Number of FTE Teachers or Aides	Program Cost[a]		Pupils in Program		Pupils per FTE		Cost per Pupil		Percentage of Pupils Served Who Met Evaluation Sample Criteria
		Total	Per FTE	Served	In Sample	Served	In Sample	Served	In Sample	
CLEAR-RR	29.0	$1,125,679	$38,817[b]	393	253	13.6	8.7	$2,864	$4,449	64.4%
Regular CLEAR (Grade 1)	1.0	$38,817[c]	$38,817	38	12	38.0	12.0	$1,022	$3,235	31.6%
Instructional Aide	90.5	$1,114,036[d]	$12,310	1,780	991	19.7	11.0	$626	$1,124	55.7%
Regular CLEAR (Grades 1-5)	52.0	$2,018,484	$38,817	2,016	1,072	38.8	20.6	$1,001	$1,883	53.2%

Note. Evaluation sample criteria differred among the programs.

[a] Cost figures include only teacher or aide costs (salaries plus fringe benefits).

[b] CLEAR-RR cost per FTE was based on actual salaries plus fringe benefits ($1,125,679) divided by FTEs (29.0) and rounded to the nearest dollar. This figure ($38,817) was then set as a constant for the Regular CLEAR Program costs per FTE. The constant was used to exclude the influence of different salary costs due to different numbers of years of teacher experience.

[c] Figures are based on the proportion of pupils served at each grade level.

[d] Cost for aides is based on maximum salary plus fringe benefits.

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

Question 8 What were the long-term effects of the CLEAR-RR Program?

Analysis 8.1 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who in 1987-88 attended a school where a compensatory program was available and who were served by a compensatory program.

Analysis 8.2 Number and percent of pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample scoring at or above the mean NCE for their classroom on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.3 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples scoring at or above the 37%ile on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.4 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples scoring at or above the 50%ile on the CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension scores in April 1988.

Analysis 8.5 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who followed a normal grade-level progression.

Analysis 8.6 Number and percent of pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who were later identified and served in a special education class.

Analyses 8.1-8.6 were conducted from available follow-up data for pupils who were in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 evaluation samples. The original 1985-86 evaluation sample was comprised of 141 pupils, of whom, 98 were discontinued and 43 were not discontinued. The 1986-87 evaluation sample was comprised of 189 pupils, of whom, 124 were discontinued and 65 were not discontinued. The 1987-88 evaluation sample was comprised of 253 pupils, of whom, 187 were discontinued and 66 were not discontinued. Not discontinued pupils only included those who received 60 or more lessons. The number of pupils included in the analyses for question 8 varied due, in part, to pupil mobility, the timing of data collection, and different restrictions inherent in the various analyses.

Table 28 contains a summary of results for Analyses 8.1, the study of the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample pupils who were served by a compensatory program in 1987-88. The analysis included three compensatory programs: the CLEAR-Elementary Program (CLEAR-Regular), the CLEAR-Elementary (CLEAR-CAI), and the first-grade Instructional Aide Program. Analysis 8.1 did not include pupils who were on a waiting list of pupils to be served. The criterion scores used to establish eligibility and priority for program service varied from program to program and school to school.

Of the 141 pupils in the 1985-86 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample, 88 pupils were in a school and at a grade level where a compensatory program was in operation during the 1987-88 school year. Of these 88 pupils, 42.0% (37)

Table 28

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Samples by Compensatory Education Program Status in 1987-88

1985-86 Evaluation Sample: Grade in 1987-88	Pupil Category	Compensatory Education Program Status: Not In Comp. Ed. %	(N)	In Comp. Ed. Program: CLEAR-Regular[a] %	(N)	CLEAR-CAI[b] %	(N)	Subtotal %	(N)	Total %	(N)
2	Discontinued	66.7	(8)	33.3	(4)	0.0	(0)	33.3	(4)	100.0	(12)
	Not Discontinued	25.0	(5)	65.0	(13)	10.0	(2)	75.0	(15)	100.0	(20)
	Subtotal	40.6	(13)	53.1	(17)	6.3	(2)	59.4	(19)	100.0	(32)
3	Discontinued	70.6	(36)	19.6	(10)	9.8	(5)	29.4	(15)	100.0	(51)
	Not Discontinued	40.0	(2)	20.0	(1)	40.0	(2)	60.0	(3)	100.0	(5)
	Subtotal	67.9	(38)	19.6	(11)	12.5	(7)	32.1	(18)	100.0	(56)
	Total	58.0	(51)	31.8	(28)	10.2	(9)	42.0	(37)	100.0	(88)

(table continues)

Table 28 (continued)

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Samples by Compensatory Education Program Status in 1987-88

1986-87 Evaluation Sample: Grade in 1987-88	Pupil Category	Compensatory Education Program Status: Not in Comp. Ed. %	(N)	In Comp. Ed. Program: CLEAR-Regular[a] %	(N)	CLEAR-CAI[b] %	(N)	Instr. Aide[c] %	(N)	Subtotal %	(N)	Total %	(N)
1	Discontinued	100.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	100.0	(2)
	Not Discontinued	76.5	(26)	2.9	(1)	0.0	(0)	20.6	(7)	23.5	(8)	100.0	(34)
	Subtotal	77.8	(28)	2.8	(1)	0.0	(0)	19.4	(7)	22.2	(8)	100.0	(36)
2	Discontinued	40.0	(30)	57.3	(43)	2.7	(2)	0.0	(0)	60.0	(45)	100.0	(75)
	Not Discontinued	18.8	(3)	78.1	(12.5)[d]	3.1	(.5)	0.0	(0)	81.3	(13)	100.1[e]	(16)
	Subtotal	36.3	(33)	61.0	(55.5)	2.7	(2.5)	0.0	(0)	63.7	(58)	100.0	(91)
	Total	48.0	(61)	44.1	(56)	2.4	(3)	5.5	(7)	52.0	(66)	100.0	(127)

Note. Pupils served from September 28 through the end of the school year were included in the "In Comp. Ed. Program" category. Pupils on a waiting list to be served were included in the "Not in Comp. Ed." Category. Excludes pupils in school/grade combinations where compensatory education programs were not offered.

[a]CLEAR-Regular is the Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading Elementary Program.

[b]CLEAR-CAI is the Compensatory Language Experiences and Reading Elementary Computer-Assisted Instruction Program.

[c]Inst. Aide is the Instructional Aide Program (grade 1 only).

[d]One pupil was in the CLEAR-Regular Program and the CLEAR-CAI Program.

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

were served in a compensatory program. By grade level, 59.4% (19) of the 32 pupils in grade 2 were served, compared to 32.1% (18) of the 56 pupils in grade 3. In each grade level the percentage served was lower for the pupils who had been discontinued in 1985-86 than for the pupils who had not been discontinued. In grade 2, 33.3% (4) of the 12 discontinued pupils were served in a compensatory program compared to 75.0% (15) of the 20 not discontinued pupils. In grade 3, 29.4% (15) of the 51 discontinued pupils were served in a compensatory program compared to 60.0% (3) of the 5 not discontinued pupils. Overall, 30.2% (19) of the 63 discontinued pupils in grades 2 and 3 were served in a compensatory program in 1987-88, two years after they completed the CLEAR-RR Program.

Of the 189 pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample, 127 pupils were in a school and at a grade level where a compensatory program was in operation during the 1987-88 school year. Of these 127 pupils, 52.0% (66) were served in a compensatory education program. By grade level, 22.2% (8) of the 36 pupils in grade 1 were served, compared to 63.7% (58) of the 91 pupils in grade 2. In each grade level, as in the 1985-86 evaluation sample, the percentage served was lower for the pupils who had been discontinued than for the pupils who had not been discontinued. In grade 1 neither of the 2 discontinued pupils was served, compared to 23.5% (8) of the 34 not discontinued pupils. In grade 2, 60.0% (45) of the 75 discontinued pupils were served compared to 81.3% (13) of the 16 not discontinued pupils. Overall, 54.3% (45) of the 77 discontinued pupils in grades 1 and 2 were served in a compensatory program in 1987-88, the year after they completed the CLEAR-RR Program.

Only pupils who had a normal grade-level progression at posttest time were included in analyses 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4. Valid CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension posttest scores from April 1988 were available for 61 of the 141 pupils who were in the 1985-86 evaluation sample, of whom, 58 were discontinued and 3 were not discontinued. Of the 189 pupils in the 1986-87 evaluation sample, valid CTBS Total Reading posttest scores were available for 128 pupils. Of the 128 pupils, 107 were discontinued and 21 were not discontinued. Valid CTBS Reading Comprehension posttest scores were available for 108 of the 189 pupils in the 1986-87 evaluation sample of whom, 88 were discontinued and 20 were not discontinued. Only pupils in the 1986-87 evaluation sample were included in Analysis 8.2.

For Analysis 8.2 the April 1988 CTBS Total Reading and Reading Comprehension NCE scores for pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample were compared to their homeroom average NCE scores for April 1988. The CTBS scores were available from districtwide testing. The number of test scores available per homeroom varied. Homeroom averages based on fewer than 10 scores were excluded because they were considered unrepresentative of the class.

Of the 189 pupils in the 1986-87 CLEAR-RR evaluation sample, CTBS Total Reading NCE scores and homeroom average NCE scores were available for 118 pupils. Of this number, 98 pupils had been discontinued in 1986-87 and 20 pupils had not. Results of the analysis indicated that of the 118 pupils with available test data, 25.4% (30) reached their homeroom average NCE

score. By pupil category, 28.6% (28) of the 98 discontinued pupils compared to 10.0% (2) of the 20 not discontinued pupils reached their homeroom average NCE score. Of the 30 pupils who reached their homeroom average in Total Reading, 33.3% (10) scored below the 37%ile and thereby still qualified for a Chapter 1 compensatory reading program. The homeroom average NCE scores for Total Reading ranged from 25 to 66.

Reading Comprehension NCE scores and homeroom average NCE scores were available for 97 of the 189 pupils in the 1986-87 evaluation sample. Of the 97 pupils, 78 pupils had been discontinued in 1986-87 and 19 pupils had not. Results of the analysis showed that of the 97 pupils with available test data, 27.8% (27) reached their homeroom average NCE score. By pupil category 33.3% (26) of the 78 discontinued pupils compared to 5.3% (1) for the 19 not discontinued pupils reached their homeroom average NCE score. The homeroom average NCE scores for Reading Comprehension ranged from 24 to 62.

Results of analyses 8.3 and 8.4 showed that greater percentages of pupils scored at or above the specified percentiles in Reading Comprehension than did in Total Reading (see Table 29). Moreover, greater percentages of discontinued pupils than not discontinued pupils scored at or above the specified percentiles. Results for the 1985-86 evaluation sample indicated that in Total Reading, 41.0% (25) of the 61 evaluation sample pupils with valid test data scored at or above the 37%ile and 23.0% (14) scored at or above the 50%ile. By pupil category, 43.1% (25) of the 58 discontinued pupils scored at or above the 37%ile and 24.1% (14) scored at or above the 50%ile. On the Reading Comprehension subtest, 45.9% (28) of the 61 evaluation sample pupils and 48.3% (28) of the 58 discontinued pupils reached the 37%ile. For the 1986-87 evaluation sample, in Total Reading, 25.8% (33) of the 128 evaluation sample pupils with valid test data scored at or above the 37%ile and 13.3% (17) reached the 50%ile. By pupil category, 30.8% (33) of the 107 discontinued pupils reached the 37%ile and 15.9% (17) reached the 50%ile. On the Reading Comprehension subtest, 34.3% (37) of the 108 evaluation sample pupils, 40.9% (36) of the 88 discontinued pupils, and 5.0% (1) of the 20 not discontinued pupils scored at or above the 37%ile.

Table 30 summarizes results for Analysis 8.5, the distributions of pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples who followed a normal grade-level progression. Only pupils who were enrolled in the Columbus Public Schools during the month of November in all of their follow-up years (1986, 1987, and/or 1988) were included in the analysis. The numbers of pupils included from the three evaluation samples were: 106 pupils (75.2%) from the 1985-86 evaluation sample, 168 pupils (88.9%) from the 1986-87 evaluation sample, and 243 pupils (96.0%) from the 1987-88 evaluation sample [a total of 517 pupils (88.7%) from the combined samples].

The percentages of pupils who followed a normal grade-level progression were as follows: 51.9% (55) of the 106 pupils from the 1985-86 sample followed a normal grade-level progression into the fourth grade; 67.3% (113) of the 168 pupils from the 1986-87 evaluation sample followed a normal progression into the third grade; and 84.3% (206) of the 243 pupils from the 1987-88 evaluation sample followed a normal grade-level progression into the second grade in 1988-89. Overall, 72.3% (374) of the 519 pupils in the analysis followed a normal grade-level progression and 27.7% (143) did not.

Table 29

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Samples Who Reached the 37%ile and/or the 50%ile on the CTBS Reading Comprehension and Total Reading Posttest in April 1988

	Subtest									
	Reading Comprehension					Total Reading				
		37%ile		50%ile			37%ile		50%ile	
Evaluation Sample	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
1985-86										
Disontinued	(58)	48.3	(28)	32.8	(19)	(58)	43.1	(25)	24.1	(14)
Not Discontinued	(3)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	(3)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)
Subtotal	(61)	45.9	(28)	31.1	(19)	(61)	41.0	(25)	23.0	(14)
1986-87										
Discontinued	(88)	40.9	(36)	23.9	(21)	(107)	30.8	(33)	15.9	(17)
Not Discontinued	(20)	5.0	(1)	0.0	(0)	(21)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)
Subtotal	(108)	34.3	(37)	19.4	(21)	(128)	25.8	(33)	13.3	(17)

Note. Only includes pupils who had a normal grade-level progression and for whom valid CTBS scores were available.

Table 30

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Samples by Grade-Level Progression Through November 1988

Evaluation Sample	Grade-Level Progression: Not Normal %	Not Normal (N)	Normal %	Normal (N)	Total %	Total (N)
1985-86						
Discontinued	27.1	(19)	72.9	(51)	100.0	(70)
Not Discontinued	88.9	(32)	11.1	(4)	100.0	(36)
Subtotal	48.1	(51)	51.9	(55)	100.0	(106)
1986-87						
Discontinued	12.0	(13)	88.0	(95)	100.0	(108)
Not Discontinued	70.0	(42)	30.0	(18)	100.0	(60)
Subtotal	32.7	(55)	67.3	(113)	100.0	(168)
1987-88						
Discontinued	.6	(1)	99.4	(177)	100.0	(178)
Not Discontinued	55.4	(36)	44.6	(29)	100.0	(65)
Subtotal	15.2	(37)	84.8	(206)	100.0	(243)
Total						
Discontinued	9.3	(33)	90.7	(323)	100.0	(356)
Not Discontinued	68.3	(110)	31.7	(51)	100.0	(161)
Subtotal	27.7	(143)	72.3	(374)	100.0	(517)

Note. The 1985-86 evaluation sample was followed for 3 years (normal progression into grade 4), the 1986-87 evaluation sample for 2 years (normal progression into grade 3), and the 1987-88 evaluation sample for 1 year (normal progression into grade 2). Only pupils enrolled in the Columbus Public Schools during November in each of their follow-up years were included in the analysis.

In each of the three evaluation samples a greater percentage of discontinued pupils than not discontinued pupils followed the normal progression. For discontinued pupils, the percentages who followed the normal progression ranged from 72.9% for the 1985-86 evaluation sample pupils to 99.4% for the 1987-88 evaluation sample pupils. For not discontinued pupils, the percentages who followed a normal progression ranged from 11.1% for the 1985-86 evaluation sample pupils to 44.6% for the 1987-88 evaluation sample pupils.

Some of the pupils who did not follow a normal grade-level progression were retained in grade 1 and, except for the 1987-88 sample, others were retained in subsequent grade-levels. For the pupils who were included in the analyses, the retention rates in grade 1 were: 25.5% for the 1985-86 evaluation sample, 20.8% for the 1986-87 evaluation sample, 15.2% for the 1987-88 evaluation sample, and 19.1% for the 517 pupils in the three evaluation samples combined. The retention rates in grade 2 were: 19.8% for the 1985-86 sample and 11.9% for the 1986-87 sample.

Tables 31-33 contain summaries of analysis 8.6 which followed the special education status of pupils from the 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 CLEAR-RR evaluation samples through November 1988. The analysis included three types of special education programs: communication disorder, developmental handicap, and learning disability. The percentages of pupils from the evaluation samples who were served in special education were: For the 1985-86 evaluation sample, 14.1% in November 1986, 10.9% in November 1987, and 17.1% in November 1988; for the 1986-87 evaluation sample, 6.6% in November 1987 and 10.8% in November 1988; and for the 1987-88 evaluation sample, 14.4% in November 1988. Over the three follow-up years, service for communication disorders related to speech, hearing, and language problems occurred more frequently than service for developmental handicaps and learning disabilities combined. The percentages of discontinued versus not discontinued pupils in special education were compared within each grade-level and within each follow-up year within each evaluation sample. In general, results indicated that higher percentages of not discontinued pupils than discontinued pupils were in special education.

Table 31

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Special Education Status in November 1986, 1987, and 1988

Followup Year / Grade as of:	Pupil Category	Special Education Status: Not In Special Education		In Special Education: Communication Disorder		In Special Education: Developmental Handicap		In Special Education: Learning Disability		In Special Education: Subtotal		Total	
		%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
11/86													
1	Discontinued	100.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	100.0	(2)
	Not Discontinued	66.7	(18)	25.9	(7)	7.4	(2)	0.0	(0)	33.3	(9)	100.0	(27)
	Subtotal	69.0	(20)	24.1	(7)	6.9	(2)	0.0	(0)	31.0	(9)	100.0	(29)
2	Discontinued	90.9	(80)	8.0	(7)	0.0	(0)	1.1	(1)	9.1	(8)	100.0	(88)
	Not Discontinued	91.7	(11)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	8.3	(1)	8.3	(1)	100.0	(12)
	Subtotal	91.0	(91)	7.0	(7)	0.0	(0)	2.0	(2)	9.0	(9)	100.0	(100)
	Total	86.0	(111)	10.9	(14)	1.6	(2)	1.6	(2)	14.1	(18)	100.1	(129)
11/87													
2	Discontinued	94.4	(17)	5.6	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	5.6	(1)	100.0	(18)
	Not Discontinued	78.1	(25)	15.6	(5)	6.3	(2)	0.0	(0)	21.9	(7)	100.0	(32)
	Subtotal	84.0	(42)	12.0	(6)	4.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	16.0	(8)	100.0	(50)
3	Discontinued	96.8	(60)	1.6	(1)	0.0	(0)	1.6	(1)	3.2	(2)	100.0	(62)
	Not Discontinued	57.1	(4)	0.0	(0)	14.3	(1)	28.6	(2)	42.9	(3)	100.0	(7)
	Subtotal	92.8	(64)	1.4	(1)	1.4	(1)	4.3	(3)	7.1	(5)	99.9	(69)
	Total	89.1	(106)	5.9	(7)	2.5	(3)	2.5	(3)	10.9	(13)	100.0	(119)

(table continues)

Table 31 (continued)

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1985-86 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Special Education Status in November 1986, 1987, and 1988

Followup Year Grade as of:	Pupil Category	Special Education Status: Not In Special Education %	(N)	In Special Education: Communication Disorder %	(N)	Developmental Handicap %	(N)	Learning Disability %	(N)	Subtotal %	(N)	Total %	(N)
11/88													
3	Discontinued	85.0	(17)	5.0	(1)	0.0	(0)	10.0	(2)	15.0	(3)	100.0	(20)
	Not Discontinued	67.6	(23)	5.9	(2)	14.7	(5)	11.8	(4)	32.4	(11)	100.0	(34)
	Subtotal	74.1	(40)	5.6	(3)	9.3	(5)	11.1	(6)	26.0	(14)	100.1	(54)
4	Discontinued	92.5	(49)	3.8	(2)	0.0	(0)	3.8	(2)	7.6	(4)	100.1	(53)
	Not Discontinued	75.0	(3)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	25.0	(1)	25.0	(1)	100.0	(4)
	Subtotal	91.2	(52)	3.5	(2)	0.0	(0)	5.3	(3)	8.8	(5)	100.0	(57)
	Total	82.8	(92)	4.5	(5)	4.5	(5)	8.1	(9)	17.1	(19)	99.9	(111)

Note. Due to rounding some total percents do not equal 100.0. One discontinued pupil in grade 2 in November 1988 who was not in special education was excluded from the analysis.

Table 32

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1986-87 CLFAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Special Education Status in November 1987 and 1988

Followup Year / Grade as of:	Pupil Category	Special Education Status: Not In Special Education %	(N)	In Special Education: Communication Disorder %	(N)	Developmental Handicap %	(N)	Learning Disability %	(N)	Subtotal %	(N)	Total %	(N)
11/87													
1	Discontinued	100.0	(2)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	100.0	(2)
	Not Discontinued	91.7	(33)	2.8	(1)	2.8	(1)	2.8	(1)	8.4	(3)	100.0	(36)
	Subtotal	92.1	(35)	2.6	(1)	2.6	(1)	2.6	(1)	7.8	(3)	99.9	(38)
2	Discontinued	94.8	(110)	4.3	(5)	0.0	(0)	.9	(1)	5.2	(6)	100.0	(116)
	Not Discontinued	89.3	(25)	3.6	(1)	3.6	(1)	3.6	(1)	10.8	(3)	100.1	(28)
	Subtotal	93.8	(135)	4.2	(6)	.7	(1)	1.4	(2)	6.3	(9)	100.1	(144)
	Total	93.4	(170)	3.8	(7)	1.1	(2)	1.6	(3)	6.6	(12)	100.0	(182)
11/88[a]													
2	Discontinued	92.9	(13)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	7.1	(1)	7.1	(1)	100.0	(14)
	Not Discontinued	75.6	(31)	4.9	(2)	9.8	(4)	9.8	(4)	24.5	(10)	100.1	(41)
	Subtotal	80.0	(44)	3.6	(2)	7.3	(4)	9.1	(5)	20.0	(11)	100.0	(55)
3	Discontinued	96.8	(92)	1.1	(1)	1.1	(1)	1.1	(1)	3.3	(3)	100.1	(95)
	Not Discontinued	77.8	(14)	0.0	(0)	11.1	(2)	11.1	(2)	22.2	(4)	100.0	(18)
	Subtotal	93.8	(106)	.9	(1)	2.7	(3)	2.7	(3)	6.3	(7)	100.1	(113)
	Total	89.3	(150)	1.8	(3)	4.2	(7)	4.8	(8)	10.8	(18)	100.1	(168)

Note. Due to rounding some total percents do not equal 100.0.

[a]One not discontinued pupil in grade 1 in November 1988 who was enrolled in a special education developmental program was excluded from the analysis.

Table 33

Percent and Number of Pupils in the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR Evaluation Sample
by Special Education Status in November 1988

Followup Year Grade as of:	Pupil Category	Special Education Status: Not In Special Education		In Special Education: Communication Disorder		In Special Education: Developmental Handicap		In Special Education: Learning Disability		In Special Education: Subtotal		Total	
		%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
11/88													
1	Discontinued	100.0	(1)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	100.0	(1)
	Not Discontinued	72.2	(26)	13.9	(5)	5.6	(2)	8.3	(3)	27.8	(10)	100.0	(36)
	Subtotal	73.0	(27)	13.5	(5)	5.4	(2)	8.1	(3)	27.0	(10)	100.0	(37)
2	Discontinued	90.4	(160)	8.5	(15)	0.0	(0)	1.1	(2)	9.6	(17)	100.0	(177)
	Not Discontinued	72.4	(21)	13.8	(4)	6.9	(2)	6.9	(2)	27.6	(8)	100.0	(29)
	Subtotal	87.9	(181)	9.2	(19)	1.0	(2)	1.9	(4)	12.1	(25)	100.0	(206)
	Total	85.6	(208)	9.9	(24)	1.6	(4)	2.9	(7)	14.4	(35)	100.0	(243)

EVALSRVCS/P501/RPTFCRR88
07/14/89

Summary/Recommendations

In 1987-88 the CLEAR-RR program was located in 26 elementary schools and had a staff of 57 teachers (29 FTEs). The program served a total of 393 underachieving first-grade pupils who appeared unlikely to read successfully without intensive instruction. The pupils were enrolled in the program for an average of 84.5 days, attended the program an average of 71.6 days, and received an average of 56.2 lessons. The number of lessons received ranged from none to 122.

Pupils were discontinued from the program based on scores on diagnostic measures indicating that they were reading at the average level for their classroom and based on teacher judgment that the pupils had developed effective reading strategies. Of the 393 pupils, 51.1% (201) were discontinued, 17.8% (70) received 60 or more lessons but were not discontinued, and 31.0% (122) were not discontinued and received less than 60 lessons. Of the 191 pupils who received 60 or more lessons, 63.4% (121) were discontinued.

The evaluation sample consisted of the 253 pupils who were discontinued or had 60 or more lessons, and who had a valid score on both the CTBS pretest and posttest. On the Total Reading posttest 15.0% (38) of the 253 pupils scored at or above the 50%ile (grade level); and 66.8% (169) scored below the 37%ile (the eligibility criterion for Chapter 1 services). The 253 pupils made an average gain of 9.6 NCEs in Total Reading. The average gain made by the 187 discontinued pupils was 12.1 NCEs, compared to an average gain of 2.6 NCEs for the 66 not discontinued pupils. Overall, 58.5% of the 253 pupils gained 7.0 or more NCEs. The percentages of pupils (for whom homeroom average scores were available) who reached their homeroom average in Total Reading were: 36.5% (54) of the evaluation sample pupils, 45.2% (52) of the discontinued pupils, and 6.1% (2) of the not discontinued pupils. Of the 54 pupils who reached their homeroom average in Total Reading, 25.9% (14) scored below the 37%ile and therefore still qualified for Chapter 1 services. The homeroom averages in Total Reading ranged from 22.4 to 62.2 NCEs.

On the Reading Recovery Diagnostic Survey, the following mean scores were obtained for September and May from a sample of 249 CLEAR-RR pupils who were discontinued or had 60 or more instructional lessons: Letter Identification 33.1 to 51.5; Ohio Word Test, .5 to 15.3; Concepts About Print, 7.4 to 16.7; Writing Vocabulary, 2.8 to 37.4; Dictation, 4.6 to 30.9. The median scores for the September and May Text Reading Levels were -1.0 (Level A) and 10.0 (Level 10). These were the levels at which pupils could read with 90% accuracy or above. The Text Reading Levels had approximate equivalents in the Ginn basal reading series. Text Reading Levels A through 2 were approximately equivalent to the Ginn Readiness Level. Text Reading Levels 9 through 12 were approximately equivalent to the Primer Level. Pupils in the school system who are beginning the Primer Level are generally considered for promotion to grade 2.

The NCE growth of CLEAR-RR pupils and pupils in other compensatory programs could not be compared because most of the CLEAR-RR pupils also were served in another program. The costs per pupil served in compensatory programs were compared. The cost per pupil served in CLEAR-RR ($2864) indicated that the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR program was an expensive one to maintain

in comparison to the other compensatory education programs. The costs for the other programs were $1,022 for Regular CLEAR (grade 1), $626 for the Instructional Aide Program, and $1,001 for Regular CLEAR (grades 1-5).

Results of the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey and Principal Survey indicated that respondents generally viewed the program as effective. On a scale of program effectiveness that ranged from +2 to -2, the average ratings for the program ranged from 1.7 to .1. The area of parent involvement received the lowest mean rating from both groups. On a scale that ranged from +2 (strongly agree) to -2 (strongly disagree) the average responses to statements that were supportive of the program ranged from 1.9 to 1.7.

The Classroom Teacher Survey included ratings related to the reading performance in 1987-88 of pupils who received CLEAR-RR in 1986-87. On a scale that ranged from +2 (successful) to -2 (unsuccessful), the average ratings on four reading items were as follows. For grade 1 (retained) pupils, the average ratings ranged from .1 to -.6. For grade 2 pupils, the average ratings ranged from .5 to .1. Within grade 2, the average ratings for discontinued pupils ranged from .6 to .2 and for not discontinued pupils ranged from -.2 to -.6. Teachers reported that 45.0% (10) of the former CLEAR-RR pupils in grade 1, and 64.3% (45) of the pupils in grade 2 achieved passing scores on basal tests of comprehension.

Parents who responded to the Parent Survey indicated that they were glad their children were in the program and thought it had helped their children. Parents reported an average of 3.5 contacts during the school year with the CLEAR-RR teacher, however, a number of parents reported no contacts. Specifically, 36.7% (22) said they did not initiate any contacts with the teacher, 14.8% (9) reported no teacher-initiated contacts, and 9.7% (6) reported no contacts of either type.

Analyses of the long-term effects of CLEAR-RR produced the following results. Of the former CLEAR-RR pupils who were in a school and at a grade level where a compensatory education program was in operation in 1987-88, 42.0% (37) of the pupils from the 1985-86 evaluation sample, and 52.0% (66) of the pupils from the 1986-87 evaluation sample were served in a compensatory program.

When tested in second grade, the homeroom average NCE score in Reading Comprehension was reached by 27.8% (27) of the pupils from the 1986-87 evaluation sample. The homeroom average NCE scores for Reading Comprehension range from 24 to 62. The homeroom average NCE score in Total Reading was reached by 25.4% (30) of the pupils from the sample. Of the 30 pupils who reached their homeroom averages in Total Reading, 33.3% (10) scored below the 37%ile and still qualified for Chapter 1 services. The homeroom average NCE scores for Total Reading ranged from 25 to 66. In Total Reading, 41.0% of the 1985-86 evaluation sample reached the 37%ile and 23.0% reached the 50%ile; 25.8% of the 1986-87 evaluation sample reached the 37%ile and 13.3% reached the 50%ile. In Reading Comprehension, 45.9% of the 1985-86 evaluation sample and 34.3% of the 1986-87 evaluation sample reached the 37%ile.

Of the 517 pupils from the combined 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 evaluation samples who remained in the Columbus Public Schools through November, 1988, 72.3% (374) followed a normal grade-level progression. The retention rates in grade 1 were: 25.5% for the 1985-86 evaluation sample (November 1986), 20.8% for the 1986-87 evaluation sample (November 1987), 15.2% for the 1987-88 evaluation sample (November 1988), and 19.1% for the 517 pupils in the three evaluation samples combined. The retention rates in grade 2 were 19.8% for the 1985-86 sample as of November 1987, and 11.9% for the 1986-87 sample as of November 1988.

The percentages of pupils from the evaluation samples who were served in special education were: For the 1985-86 evaluation sample, 14.1% in November 1986, 10.9% in November 1987, and 17.1% in November 1988; for the 1986-87 evaluation sample, 6.6% in November 1987 and 10.8% in November 1988; and for the 1987-88 evaluation sample, 14.4% in November 1988. Pupils were served more frequently for communication disorders than for developmental handicaps and learning disabilities combined.

The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program has been continued during the 1988-89 school year, and it is recommended that it continue. With that in mind, the following recommendations are presented:

1. Due to the comparatively high cost of the program, funding should remain at the current level until a higher percentage of pupils can be discontinued from the program, a lower percentage of pupils are retained in grade, and a lower percentage of pupils need further compensatory education services.

2. The retention problems in grades 1 and 2 need to be explored. Closer communication between principals, CLEAR-RR personnel, and other staff members might result in a clearer understanding of the level of success of CLEAR-RR pupils.

3. The possibility of each program teacher providing service to more pupils should be investigated. Although it is understood that pupils who begin CLEAR-RR with low skills may require more than 60 lessons, it is possible that, as teachers become better trained, they will be able to accelerate the progress of pupils. With accelerated progress, pupils may be discontinued earlier, so that others will have an opportunity to be served.

4. Close coordination between the CLEAR-RR Program and Instructional Aide Program should be planned so that the personnel in each program can be supportive of one another and of the pupils who are in both programs. Of the 253 pupils in the 1987-88 CLEAR-RR Program, 89.7% (227) also were served in the Instructional Aide Program. Or, in an effort to serve more children the two programs should be separated so that eligible pupils are served in only one program.

5. To support the efforts of CLEAR-Reading Recovery in the regular classroom, CLEAR-RR teaching approaches learned during intensive university training and follow-up inservice workshops should continue to be shared with other teachers in the Department of Federal and State Programs and with other classroom teachers serving grades 1-3 .

6. Program personnel should make efforts to improve parent involvement in and awareness of the CLEAR-RR Program. Parent involvement was the program area that received the lowest ratings from CLEAR-RR teachers and principals.

7. The criteria for discontinuing pupils from CLEAR-RR should be modified. The current criteria of reaching the class average discontinues pupils who perform at low levels on standardized tests of reading. For example, for the 1987-88 sample, the homeroom averages in Total Reading ranged from 22.4 to 62.2 NCEs. An NCE score of 22.4 equates to the 9%ile which is too low to expect the pupil to function in the regular school program without additional assistance. The Reading Recovery Program needs to establish an absolute rather than relative criteria for discontinuing pupils that will ensure that discontinued pupils are nearer to the 36%ile cut off for Chapter 1 eligibility.

8. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program and the CLEAR-Elementary Program represent two different models of service for pupils who are low achievers in reading. Pupil progress in the CLEAR-Elementary Program (in groups) and the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program (one-to-one) should be compared in the future to determine whether or not one program is more effective than the other with pupils who have certain types of reading problems and/or with pupils at specific levels of achievement. The linkages between the two programs that are being initiated in 1988-89 should be studied, that is, the service of CLEAR-RR waiting list pupils in CLEAR-Elementary groups until a vacancy occurs in CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. Issues of cost-effectiveness should be considered.

9. Program personnel should investigate alternatives for using Reading Recovery techniques in small groups in order to serve more pupils.

References

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A, & Wilkinson, A. G. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading. Washington, DC: The National Academy of Education, The National Institute of Education, The Center for the Study of Reading, U.S. Department of Education.

Bermel, S. K. (1987, March). Language development component CLEAR-reading recovery program 1985-86 (Education Consolidation and Improvement Act - Chapter 1 Final Evaluation Report). Columbus, Ohio: Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools, Department of Evaluation Services.

Clay, M. M. (1985). The early detection of reading difficulties (3rd ed.). Aukland, New Zealand: Heinemann Educational Books.

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters (1981). Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Appendix A

CLEAR-Reading Recovery Pupil Service Form (PSF)

CHAPTER 1

CLEAR READING RECOVERY
PUPIL SERVICE FORM
GRADE ONE 1987-88

Directions: Within three days of the pupil's entry into the program, complete the preprinted Pupil Service Form, fold over and staple, and place in the school mail. If no preprinted form is available, fill out information by hand. RRT is pupil's Reading Recovery Teacher.

Program Code [8 8 3 0 4]

Date Pupil Enrolled (first day of service) [ ]

Pupil's Name _____
Last First M.I.

Pupil Number [ ]

School Name _____

School Code [ ]

Room Number [ ]

RRT's Name _____

RRT's SSN [ ]

RRT's Classification: Check one

CLEAR Teacher [ ]

Classroom Teacher [ ]

Other [ ]

Today's Date ___/___/___

For Evaluation Services Only
Verified_____ Date_____
Initials

EVALSRVCS/P501/RRORIEN87
09/02/87

Appendix B

CLEAR-Reading Recovery Data Form (CRRDF)

READING RECOVERY/CHAPTER 1
DATA FORM

Student Last Name / First Name _____ Sex M F

Site Name _____ / Site No. _____

Student I.D. No. _____ Race* _____

Reading Recovery Teacher _____ / RR T. No. _____

Birthdate _____

Classroom Teacher _____

Parent Contact Dates _____

School Name _____

Street Name _____ City/State _____ Zip Code _____

Parent/ Guardian _____

Home Telephone _____ Work Telephone _____

Test Data

	Date	LI	OWT	CAP	WV	DIC	Text Rdg. Lev	%	Classroom Basal * Series	Title	Level*
Fall											
Entry											
Exit											
May											

RUNNING RECORD BOOK INFORMATION			
	Level	Title	% Acc
Lesson 2			
Last Lesson			

END OF PROGRAM DATA
(Which ONE describes the child's status?)

Date of Enrollment _____ (If known)

Number of Sessions 10 (If known)

Date of First Lesson _____

Number of Instruc. Lessons _____ (NOT including in The Known)

Chapter 1 (ONLY):

Enrollment _____

Attendance _____

Date of 80th Lesson _____

	Yes	Date (If yes)
Discontinued	☐	_____
Transferred: Out of System	☐	_____
Within System	☐	_____
Withdrawn: LD Placement	☐	_____
DH Placement	☐	_____
Other Reason:	☐	_____
Still in Program at End of Year	☐	_____

Verified by: Teacher _____ Checker _____ Teacher Leader _____
(Please initial)

* CODES FOR RACE/ LANGUAGE GROUP: 1=Non-minority, 2=Black, 3=Spanish, 4=Asian, 5=American Indian

*CODES FOR BASAL LEVEL: K, PP1, PP2, PP3, P, 1, 2-1, 2-2, 3-1, etc.

Pupil's Name _____

CHAPTER 1

Enrollment/Attendance Data

1987-88	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	M	T	W	Th	F	Enroll.	Days Absent	Attend.
August	~~24~~	~~25~~	~~26~~	~~27~~	~~28~~	~~31~~																						
Sept.		~~4~~	~~2~~	~~3~~	~~4~~	~~7~~	~~8~~	~~9~~	~~10~~	~~11~~	~~14~~	~~15~~	~~16~~	~~17~~	~~18~~	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30					
Oct.				1	2	5	6	7	8	9	12	13	14	15	16	19	20	21	22	23	26	27	28	29	30			
Nov.	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	25	26	27	30							
Dec.		1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31				
Jan.					1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	28	29			
Feb.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9	10	11	12	15	16	17	18	19	22	23	24	25	26	29							
March		1	2	3	4	7	8	9	10	11	14	15	16	17	18	21	22	23	24	25	28	29	30	31				
April					1	4	5	6	7	8	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	20	21	22	25	26	27	28	29			
May	2	3	4	5	6	9	10	11	12	13	16	17	18	19	20	23	24	25	26	27	30	31						
June			1	2	3	6	7	8	9	10	13	14	15	16	17													
																									TOTAL			

CODE

K = In the Known Sessions

1 or 2 = Number of Lessons That Day

X = Student absent from program (may be in school and absent from program for other reason)

IS = Indirect Service (Inservice Reading Recovery meetings, parent involvement day, parent conference day, etc.)

— = No School or teacher not serving students

79

112

Appendix C

CLEAR-RR Staff Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

CLEAR-RR STAFF SURVEY
1987-88

Your opinions regarding the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program are an important part of program evaluation. Please answer each item carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Complete the survey and return it to Evaluation Services via school mail (by folding and stapling the survey in reverse) by **May 20, 1988**. The answers you give will be completely confidential. Your survey will be separated from your return label to insure your anonymity. Thank you!

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the one response that best represents how effective or ineffective you think the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is in the areas listed below.

	Very Effective		In-between		Very Ineffective	Not Sure
	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
1. Coordination with the regular school program	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
2. Communication between regular classroom teachers and CLEAR-Reading-Recovery teachers	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
3. Instructional leadership by Reading Recovery teacher leaders	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
4. Teacher-Principal cooperation	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
5. Parent involvement	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
6. Quality of instruction	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
7. High teacher expectations for student learning	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
8. Pupil selection	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
9. Pupil scheduling	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
10. Improvement of student reading comprehension	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
11. Improvement of student reading fluency	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
12. Pupil achievement	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
13. Compatibility with district Course of Study	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS

(OVER)

EVALSRVCS/P501/INSRRCRR8

Circle the one response that best represents your opinion about each item below. Use the following response key:

SA	= Strongly Agree
A	= Agree
U	= Undecided
D	= Disagree
SD	= Strongly Disagree

14. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school. SA A U D SD

15. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student attendance. SA A U D SD

16. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student behavior. SA A U D SD

17. If I were a regular classroom teacher not affiliated with the Reading Recovery Program, I would continue to use whole language instructional methods (e.g., many opportunities to read and write in context) in my classroom. SA A U D SD

18. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. SA A U D SD

19. What is your present position in the Reading Recovery Program? (Please circle.) CLEAR TEACHER CLASSROOM TEACHER OTHER (Specify) _____

20. Including this year, how many years have you been a Reading Recovery teacher? (Please circle.) 1 2 3 4

21. How many pupils have you served in Reading Recovery this year? (Please fill in the blank.) _____ pupils

You may use the space below to explain one or more of your answers or to comment on the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program in general.

22. Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you!

Appendix D

Principal Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

PRINCIPAL SURVEY
1987-88

Your opinions regarding the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program are an important part of program evaluation. Please answer each item carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Complete the survey and return it to Evaluation Services via school mail (by folding and stapling the survey in reverse) by **May 20, 1988**. The answers you give will be completely confidential. Your survey will be separated from your return label to insure your anonymity. Thank you!

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the one response that best represents how effective or ineffective you think the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is in the areas listed below.

	Very Effective		In-between		Very Ineffective	Not Sure
	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
1. Coordination with the regular school program	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
2. Communication between regular classroom teachers and CLEAR-Reading-Recovery teachers	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
3. Teacher-Principal cooperation	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
4. Parent involvement	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
5. Quality of instruction	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
6. High teacher expectations for student learning	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
7. Pupil selection	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
8. Pupil scheduling	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
9. Improvement of student reading comprehension	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
10. Improvement of student reading fluency	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
11. Pupil achievement	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS
12. Compatibility with district Course of Study	+2	+1	0	-1	-2	NS

(OVER)

Circle the one response that best represents your opinion about each item below. Use the following response key:

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

13. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school. SA A U D SD

14. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student attendance. SA A U D SD

15. Although not a direct goal of Reading Recovery, I have noticed improvement of student behavior. SA A U D SD

16. I would encourage the use of whole language instructional methods (e.g., many opportunities to read and write in context) in regular classrooms in my school. SA A U D SD

17. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. SA A U D SD

18. What are your concerns about implementing Reading Recovery in your school next year?

_____
_____
_____

19. What do teachers in your school say about Reading Recovery?

_____
_____
_____

20. What do parent say about the Reading Recovery Program?

_____
_____
_____

You may use the space below to explain one or more of your answers to items 1-17 or to comment on the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program in general.

21. Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you!

Appendix E

Classroom Teacher Survey

M E M O

To: School Clerks in Selected Schools

From: Phyl Thomas, Department of Evaluation Services

Subject: Classroom Teacher Surveys for Reading Recovery

Date: May 6, 1988

Enclosed please find one or more surveys for distribution to selected classroom teachers of pupils who were in Reading Recovery last year. Each survey is for the teacher of a specified homeroom number. Please place each survey in the appropriate teacher's mailbox. If you have any questions, feel free to call me at the Department of Evaluation Services, 222-3011.

Thank you for your assistance.

CC: Dick Amorose
Sharon Bermel

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

CLASSROOM TEACHER SURVEY
1987-88

The purpose of this survey to to find out what you think about the reading performance of pupils currently in your room who were served by the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program last year and your opinions of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. Your opinions are an important part of program evaluation. Please answer each item carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. Complete the survey and return it to Evaluation Services via school mail (by folding and stapling the survey in reverse) by **May 20, 1988**. The answers you give will be completely confidential. No reporting will be done for individual pupils. Thank you for your cooperation.

Directions: Look at the white printout (next page) containing the names of pupils currently in your room who were served by the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program last year. Copy the student number, LAST NAME, and circle the grade level of each pupil from the printout onto the top of the survey form. Please answer the items for each pupil. If you have more than one pupil listed on your survey, then please complete all items for the first pupil before beginning items for the next pupil. For each item, circle the one response that best represents your opinion.

EVALSRVCS/P501/INSRRCTR8
05/04/88

RUN DATE
05 MAY 88

CHAPTER 1
CLEAR READING RECOVERY PROGRAM

1986-87 FOLLOW-UP PUPILS

SCHL CODE	HMRM NUMB	SCHOOL NAME	STUDENT NUMBER	NAME	GRADE LEVEL

PREPARED BY
EVALUATION SERVICES

	Pupil #1 Student #:_____ Name:_____ Grade: K 1 2 3	Pupil #2 Student #:_____ Name:_____ Grade: K 1 2 3	Pupil #3 Student #:_____ Name:_____ Grade: K 1 2 3	Pupil #4 Student #:_____ Name:_____ Grade: K 1 2 3
1. Is this pupil currently in your room?	YES NO----	YES NO----	YES NO----	YES NO----
2. Has this pupil been in your room long enough for you to evaluate his or her reading performance?	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO
	If NO, then do not rate this child but rate any other pupils as appropriate AND be sure to go to item 20.	If NO, then do not rate this child but rate any other pupils as appropriate AND be sure to go to item 20.	If NO, then do not rate this child but rate any other pupils as appropriate AND be sure to go to item 20.	If NO, then do not rate this child but rate any other pupils as appropriate AND be sure to go to item 20.
For items 3-13 use the following key: +2 = Very successful +1 = Successful 0 = In-between -1 = Unsuccessful -2 = Very unsuccessful	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
3. Reads and understands basal reading stories	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
4. Reads and understands supplemental reading materials used for instruction	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
5. Reads library books	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
6. Understands assignments	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
7. Works independently	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
8. Finishes seatwork	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
9. Practices self control	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
10. Writes own stories	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
11. Makes progress in reading group	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
12. Usually knows how to figure out new words	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2
13. Attends class regularly	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2	+2 +1 0 -1 -2

(CONTINUED)

For items 14-19, circle the one response that best represents your opinion.	Pupil #1 (Same pupil as previous page) Name:	Pupil #2 (Same pupil as previous page) Name:	Pupil #3 (Same pupil as previous page) Name:	Pupil #4 (Same pupil as previous page) Name:
Achieves suggested passing score on basal tests in the area of:				
14. Comprehension	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE
15. Vocabulary	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE
16. Decoding	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE
17. Is in the following reading group in my classroom	HIGH MIDDLE LOW	HIGH MIDDLE LOW	HIGH MIDDLE LOW	HIGH MIDDLE LOW
18. Earned the following letter grade in reading in the last grading period (Circle NA = NOT APPLICABLE if pupil was not enrolled)	A B C D F NA	A B C D F NA	A B C D F NA	A B C D F NA
19. Will be retained at the end of this school year	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE	YES NO NOT SURE

(CONTINUED)

Items 20-22 concern the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program.

20. Is the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program serving your school this year?

YES — If YES then go to item 21

NO — If NO then go to item 23

For items 21-22 circle the one response that best represents your opinion about each item. Use the following response key:

SA - Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree
DK = Don't Know

	SA	A	U	D	SD	DK
21. The CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program is of value to pupils in my school.	SA	A	U	D	SD	DK
22. Compared to other ways that money could be spent for compensatory reading programs in my school, I support the funding of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program.	SA	A	U	D	SD	DK

23. Circle the grade(s) you presently teach.

1 1-2(split) 2 2-3(split) OTHER _____

You may use the space below to explain one or more of your answers or to comment on the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program in general.

24. Comments: _____

_____

_____

92

Thank you!

EVALSRVCS/P501/INSRRCTR8

Appendix F

Parent Survey

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
EVALUATION SERVICES
52 Starling Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

May 6, 1988

Dear Parent,

This year your child participated in the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program at his or her elementary school. We would like to know what you think about your child's reading and writing and your opinions of the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. Your opinions are important and will help us to improve the program. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and return it in the enclosed envelope by May 20, 1988.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Phyllis M. Thomas

Phyllis M. Thomas
Evaluation Specialist

Enclosure

EVALSRVCS/P501/INSRRPAR8
05/06/88

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

PARENT SURVEY
1987-88

The purpose of this survey is to find out what you think about your child's reading and writing and the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program. Your opinions are an important part of program evaluation. Please answer each item carefully. There are no right or wrong answers. The answers you give will be completely confidential. Please put your completed survey in the enclosed envelope and mail it so that we may receive it by May 20, 1988. Return postage has been prepaid. Thank you for your cooperation.

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the one answer (YES, NO, or NOT SURE) that best gives your opinion about each item listed below.

1. At the beginning of the year I was concerned that my child would have trouble learning to read. YES NO NOT SURE

2. At the beginning of the year I was concerned that my child would have trouble learning to write his or her own stories. YES NO NOT SURE

3. I am satisfied with my child's reading progress in first grade. YES NO NOT SURE

4. I am satisfied with my child's ability to write his or her own stories in first grade. YES NO NOT SURE

5. I often help my child to read books at home. YES NO NOT SURE

6. I often help my child to write his or her own stories at home. YES NO NOT SURE

7. When my child sees a new word, he/she usually knows how to figure it out. YES NO NOT SURE

8. My child feels successful in school this year. YES NO NOT SURE

9. Before getting this survey, I knew that my child was in the Reading Recovery Program. YES NO→ If NO, then go to item 20 on the next page.

↓ If YES then go to item 10 on the next page.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

Items 10 through 21 refer specifically to your child's Reading Recovery Program (not to services provided by the regular classroom teacher, Instructional Aide, or other staff member).

10. The Reading Recovery teacher has explained to me why my child is in the program. YES NO NOT SURE

11. I am glad my child has been in the Reading Recovery program. YES NO NOT SURE

12. The Reading Recovery teacher has helped my child to improve in reading. YES NO NOT SURE

13. The Reading Recovery teacher has helped my child to improve in writing his or her own stories. YES NO NOT SURE

14. The Reading Recovery teacher has let me know how to help my child at home. YES NO NOT SURE

15. My child has said that he or she has enjoyed being in the Reading Recovery program. YES NO NOT SURE

16. I feel welcome to visit my child's Reading Recovery teacher. YES NO NOT SURE

For items 17-19, please fill in the blanks giving the approximate number of times.

17. The number of times during this school year that the Reading Recovery teacher has contacted me is: _____ times.

18. The number of times during this school year that I have contacted the Reading Recovery teacher is: _____ times.

19. The number of times during this school year that I have visited my child's Reading Recovery teacher is: _____ times.

20. Circle the number or letters that best describes your view of the Reading Recovery Program.

-2	-1	0	+1	+2	NS
Very Ineffective		In-between		Very Effective	Not Sure

You may use the space below to explain one or more of your answers or to comment on the CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program in general.

21. Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you!

Appendix G

Comments from the CLEAR-RR Staff Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

COMMENTS FROM THE CLEAR-RR STAFF SURVEY
1987-88

Students who have not shown any progress after 50 or so lessons need to be dropped from the program so other students who can benefit from the program can be served.

I find it hard to combine RR w/ regular 1st grade duties. There is too much to do in order to do both jobs well. As a consequence, I often feel frustrated.

I feel more time should be allocated to analyzing running records and preparing for the next day's lesson without the teacher working till 5' o'clock every night. Preparing for the whole class plus reading recovery requires too much of teacher's "own" time. Too much repetitive paper work. No carry over for children in second grade. Some discontinued children will now repeat 2nd grade.

(1) 1/2 day in-service only in order to keep our schedules consistent (2) Need more feedback from [staff member] on home visits regarding absenteeism (3) Fall testing gives too late a start with reading recovery lesson (4) Time in fall to give booster lesson to students in need from previous year.

I would use the whole language approach in teaching language arts (reading etc.) because it encourages the child to use what he knows as a springboard to further knowledge.

I have grown as a teacher more in the last two years than I did my first ten years. It's a shame that more people don't know about the reading process and how successful it can be when implemented through a whole language approach!

Reading Recovery has caused the students being served to make outstanding progress in reading. Without Reading Recovery I strongly feel most of our at-risk students would be retained. Instead, they are working at an average first grade level. Also, RR has shown me the important link between reading and writing. And reading can be taught without using one worksheet!

There need to be more teacher-leaders so that they can make more visits or colleague visits need to become a regular part of RR.

[#]3 - I feel their case load is too big.
Reading Recovery should be paired with 1/2 CLEAR teaching instead of 1/2 day classroom.

#3 Our teacher leaders need more help.

(1) Other 1st grade and 2nd grade teachers should be able to attend an inservice on RR. procedures so hopefully there would be more carry-over into their own classroom teaching. There isn't enough reinforcement of what we teach in the regular classes. (16) My students in RR seem to have a better self concept now & this seems to help with their behavior.

This is a great program because it is self supportive in that not a lot of parent involvement and classroom teacher involvement is needed. The children learn to read and they learn to be self-efficient.

EVALSRVCS/P501/ECOMCRRS8
05/09/89

Reading Recovery is a definite asset to the total reading program. More emphasis on meaning sentences and the story structure as a whole is of more importance then memorizing vocabulary end emphasizing the phonics approach

We need better guidelines for selecting students. Too many times children who belong in another program are with us with no help discontinuing. How can you make someone average when they do not have the physical ability or potential to be average.

Let us RR teachers throw out the Met [MAT?] test scores and use our diagnostic survey results to soley determine eligibility and placement in RR - We are trained. We aren't guessing! Trust us

There must be more cooperation with classroom teachers. Children should not be taken from classes when the teacher does not want the program. I have a child discontinued and the teacher wants to retain her.

#8 If a student is still at level 2 or 3 after a given amount of lessons another child should be selected.

I think a workshop should be provided for regular classrm. teachers so they could see what is being done. They also need to see a lesson behind the glass.

Classroom teachers are not seeing the improvement of students carry over in the classroom. I have two children reading at level 14 & 15 in RR. In the classroom they are only in the beginning of Inside My Hat and the teacher feels both should fail the first grade.

#8 We need to look at children who are in the program for 80-90 lessons and still on Level 2 or 3 - maybe our program isn't for them! There should be a cut off - this isn't cost effective!

(#1) classroom teachers need inservice to see what we do in rdg. recovery or ways to support in 2nd, 3rd etc. grades. (#8) Forget Metropolitan or CTBS as placement instruments - the 6 tests in the diagnostic survey are much more indicative of need! (#9) More time between students for paperwork to ensure accuracy

Reading Recovery is the break through, which enables teachers to help children read who otherwise would have never achieved fluency.

R.R. is Great!

The difficult part of R.R. is to share a classroom. The 1/2 day room and 1/2 day RR is very difficult. RR may be more effective with an all day RR teacher !!!!

A very effective program which makes the tchr. reexamine method of tchg. rdg. and improves the over-all rdg. in general. One great need - identifying DH kids early so kids that can be helped may be served. We waste our energy and see no progress.

I feel we need to look at the selection process yet again. Too much time is spent on kids that end up in D.H. classes.

I would like consideration to be given to holding workshops for other 1st grade teachers in the building whose children we serve. The R.R. teachers could take their class for 1/2 day before we start our program. This workshop should be to give them a brief overview of the program and address their role in the program. Consideration & implementation of the colleague visit idea would be very helpful.

#2 It would be nice to have some kind of informational session for all regular teachers. Maybe at the instructional aide inservice.
#3 [Teacher leader] was excellent!! SUPER!! Fabulous!!
#4 Our principal was not supportive in many areas, even outside of Reading Recovery. He said good things about Reading Recovery but he did not seem to understand how it works. He never came to observe a lesson even when invited several times.

[#]8 & [#]9 - Testing is fine. I feel we should schedule the high scorers first, get them in & out fast, let low lows mature and review after the summer when they've had no reading at home (in our area)
[#]15. Our kids are in school even when they're sick (sort of a baby sitting service)
[#]16. Some behaved better, some worse

One of the teachers had such a radically different philosophy that it was extremely difficult to deal w/ him & his students (4 of my 7 were from his room). I know we have to serve the lowest, but it's difficult to help all the children at risk when you have the same ones for so long because the discontinuing test is too difficult for them.

I feel R.R. is a wonderful program. For it to be totally effective there needs to be a follow up program in 2nd grade. When a child is discontinued he/she goes back to a classroom setting of traditional phonics reading (providing the child's teacher is not a R.R. teacher) This is a great confusion to the child because he/she wants to please the teacher. These 1st grade non R.R. recovery teachers need to be inserviced. When a discontinued child gets in 2nd grade the teacher (for the most part) follows the basal reader teacher's manual. Phonics are stressed & these children become confused again. I am quoting a 2nd grade teacher who is retaining a child who was in R.R. in 1st grade "this child is being retained because she can not decode". Has this teacher tried an alternative to teach reading without relying only on decoding skills? I feel this is a short coming if R.R. - these 2nd grade teachers need to be inserviced more than once in the basics of R.R.

1) 1/2 day inservice only in order to keep schedule consistent 2) feedback from [staff member] on home visits regarding absenteeism 3) Fall testing gives to[o] late a start 4) time in fall to give booster lessons to student in need from year before 5) equal A.M. & P.M. time at RR schools this should be inforced by downtown administration & not by building principals 6) all first grade teachers at RR schools should have inservice training on RR methods

Changing lives - Students are learning to read in first grade instead of trying to play catch-up

Additional Comments

Item 1

In the reading recovery class it is co-ord. Not enough time to co-ord. w/ teachers who aren't R.R.

Except in reading recovery rooms

with all but 1 teacher

depends on classroom teacher

except in R.R. rooms

Item 2

with all but 1 teacher

It's all in what each Reading-Recovery teacher does.

Item 5

depends on parent

Item 8

Lowest need more experiencial background before entering reading recovery

lowest need more experiencial background before entering RR

Item 9

Unequal time

unequal time

Item 13

who cares?

Item 21

(+7 McArthur grant)

Appendix H

Comments from the Principal Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

COMMENTS FROM THE PRINCIPAL SURVEY
1987-88

18. What are your concerns about implementing Reading Recovery in your school next year?

None

We are not to receive the program next year

We served 3 students who later tested as DH - This takes up many weeks, children on waiting list could receive assistance earlier. Perhaps the very lowest children should be on wait list???

My biggest concern is that it does not go through all of the primary grades. At this school, it is needed.

Let RR teachers have more to say in the selection of students. Sometimes students with the lowest test scores may qualify for DH, while a more average child has to wait for Reading Recovery assistance.

We love this program, but it is concentrated upon such a small No. of pupils.

I don't have any

None

I wish it could be expanded for all first grades. I'm pleased with the team and have no concerns about the teacher team. I'm glad to have them and the program

Keeping it here at [school] - not moving program or people.

Space available -

None

We are in full implementation

None

Would like to continue as it is -

My concern is for students making progress but not discontinued. I would like to see those students along with those not picked up in first grade be served in second grade (Use of another CLEAR teacher?)

EVALSRVCS/P501/ECOMRRPR8
05/09/89

19. What do teachers in your school say about Reading Recovery?

very much in favor

Most (especially K-3) are very interested in the program. They can see the benefits for the regular classroom.

Positive and supportive comments

They like it

Same as 18, above.

Great!

Program seems to[o] rigid. Many regulations that don't make sense or are counter productive.

Very effective with small number of students

They are positive and feel the students are making alot of progress.

It has really helped.

Favorable

It is a very good program. Children are helped as a direct result of this program

I have heard no negative comments.

Surprisingly, very little comments

Acknowledge the technique and successes of the program

Like Program

They want the material to be made available to them

I have never seen teachers as enthusiastic and "sold" on a program as I have with Reading Recovery.

20. What do parent say about the Reading Recovery Program?

They like R.R. program

Most of the parents at this school have commented that their kids have made good progress. I am not sure the parents totally understand the direct benefit of Reading Recovery.

They are extremely happy and positive about the program.

They like it.

They love it, if their child is in it.

Wonderful!

?

They like it very much

They feel they are learning to read at a faster rate.

Very positive

Have not heard

They like it.

All comments have been [?]

Very little input

Applaud it

like it.

No response

They like the program and are very pleased with their child's progress.

21. Comments

An excellent program however, I feel that RR teachers should either spend full day in classroom or with student - not mix the 2.

The Reading Recover[y] Program had a very rocky start this year. The R.R. teacher was ill with cancer and never arrived at school. After many dates (unkept) to arrive at school, she passed away in March. Because of this the Reading Recovery program at [school] got off to a very late start. I am basicly very much in favor of the R.R. program. The situation at [school] has been completely different this year. - What ever I might say on this questionaire would be skewed by [the teacher's] situation.

see Item #1

This is a proven program that works!

I [am?] very pleased with reading.

This is the best thing that has ever happened to Hubbard School.

I wish I have [had] the space & personnel to expand the program in my building!

Early intervention is best. This program provides the best, most direct and effective early intervention instruction I have seen!

I feel given more literature in the classroom & training all students could benefit from this program

It is a great program for helping children. It has reduced the retention rate of our first graders. The children feel good about themselves.

Additional Comments

Item 1

Some improvement this year with in-service

Item 16

Oh YES!!!

Appendix I

Comments from the Classroom Teacher Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

COMMENTS FROM THE CLASSROOM TEACHER SURVEY
1987-88

[Pupil] is a success story for the Clear-Reading Recovery Program. [Pupil] has made alot of progress this year! She is currently reading in Give Me A Clue. She loves to read for enjoyment & reads whenever she is allowed.

I think the Clear Reading Program with [teacher] is much more cost effective than the Reading Recovery program. I believe one Reading Recovery teacher would be better for the children than having one teacher in the classroom in the morning & another in the P.M. Due to so much absenteeism of first graders and the mobility of the students I think there should be 10 children assigned for 4 days a week and then for those who are present - 5 days a week. I think tutoring only 2 or 3 children for a day is very expensive. Also, when a child moves the last 2 months of school and they aren't replaced in the program it also increases the cost per pupil served.

Richard has a speech problem which interferes with his decoding skills. He picks up eight vocabulary more quickly.

I strongly agree that this program can be an outstanding help to the proper child. I feel something is wrong with selection. The child reviewed here is very D.H. (tested and ready for placement in a special class next year.) Two of my Reading Recovery students this year will be tested for D.H. soon. These children should have been discontinued. The Kindergarten teacher has indicated she felt this child was D.H.

The children in my school seem to need more support from parents. Some of the children move frequently, and their attendance is poor.

A number of my CLEAR students have moved ahead rapidly this year - due in part, I'm sure to this program. Several ended up in my top group (3d grade reader) [Teacher] is super!

Reading Recovery is a great program, which has serviced several of my students this year. I think the classroom teacher should have some input in selecting the students to be served.

The success to any program, especially Reading, is continuity. If the CLEAR/Reading Recovery teacher is absent, the program stops for that day or week. This shouldn't happen. If more money is allocated then, by all means, hire more resource teachers for the program. These children need the continuity of the program.

[Pupil] just moved two weeks ago. He was repeating first grade and was very successful. [Pupil] is very young and immature. He will be repeating second grade. Mother is very supportive of this idea.

CLEAR-Rd. Reovery [Recovery] are good, but what happens when they leave 1st grade? I've tried to obtain advice/help through these programs for children who need something like this in 2nd grade (Either they were skipped over last year or ?) I was told our school had no 2nd grade materials, so no assistance or further advice given.

Every school should have Clear-Rdg. Recovery program regardless of amount of students of low income status. There are students in my school needing additional help and not being served.

From what I've seen of Reading Recovery, I feel its a great program but doesn't meet enough students who need it, and could benefit from it.

I am a new teacher in this school as of the beginning of the 4th quarter. I answered the questions as best as I could.

Any second grade student reading on first level receives an F on their report card in reading Both students will complete across the Fence - this year

The Clear Program is great. [Pupil] should be in SBH not the regular classroom

I think the student I evaluated will eventually be put in a special class.

[Pupil] comes from an unsupportive home environment. Perhaps in a more supportive environment reading recovery would do better.

I wish that it could be possible for second graders to be in a Clear program. The more help they (children) get, the better it is for them. They are so interested in Reading at school, but it is not continued at home by parents.

[Pupil] can do some decoding, but like many others, he is weaker in this area.

CLEAR/RR serves my school but not my grade level. In Sept. 1 out of 21 students was on grade level in reading. They would have benefitted a great deal from CLEAR/RR assistance. This child in particular needed more assistance.

[Pupil] hearing problems re-occurred during this school year and probably interfered with her hearing sounds (i.e. vowel) and attributed to her achieving below the suggested passing score on basal tests in the areas of comprehension and Decoding.

I am not completely familiar with the reading recovery program because I have not worked on primary level for several years, until now.

It usually, in past experience, this yr. being the exception, has still required extra tutoring in 2nd grade for these children. They also, do not enter at 2nd grade reading level.

I am unfamiliar with the program; however, [pupil] would greatly, benefit by continued assistance in reading.

I don't have much contact with program. Seems to me there must be a way to serve more children.

My aide is very good; therefore, the program is effective. There are, however, other aides in our building whom are not very good and their students do not benefit as much. Of course, we will lose one aide next year - mine. The good one goes, the others stay! Bad system.

At our school we need more help with students functioning below grade level- At the second grade level each of us have 30 students and get no help from Clear, etc. It seems to me all of your Clear should focus on the lower grades By the time the students are in 4th-5th it's too late!

Even though I feel the program could be of value, when there is no primary follow-up to Reading Recovery in second grade I don't see how the remediation can help! There must be an opportunity for each school to have CLEAR at all levels-we have no primary!

I would like to have this program continued at our school. The children that were in Reading Recovery feel confident about their ability to read and write.

Record Keeping- [pupil] is not in Clear - he is in ESL.

My low reading groups served by Clear-Reading have confindence and love of reading.

This survey is not appropriate for a low functioning DH child.

I would like to see the program extended to include 2nd grade children. - Half of the children in my classroom of the children in my classroom this year were reading at least 6 mths. to 1 year behind grade level when they entered in September. - If Reading Recovery cannot be offered, perhaps some tutors or aides could be available to continue to help these children progress.

[Teacher] is doing an excellent job!

How much can it help to have reading recovery in first grade and then no remedial help in second grade?

I felt like the last 3 months that the students were deprived the class due to the teacher being out. Many times it was not for sickness students need the consistency.

Both students are repeaters and so can not be retained[-] Pupil #2 has been accepted for SLD placement and Pupil #1 will be retested next year. These are not a good sample of Reading Recovery. The program works very well. Other years I have had students who were in Reading Recovery and they were successful. I feel the program should be expanded to more schools!

I feel the Clear-Reading-Recovery Program should be in our school. It was last year but was taken away and it is needed more than ever and would be helpful to the children! I do support the funding of the Program!

[Pupil] was not enrolled in Clear-Reading Recovery Program. Her test scores at the beginning of second grade was not that bad
[Pupil] a Cambodian, came to me four months ago. He is in E.S.L.

I have only taught for 3 years. I have found I average 3-5 R.R. "graduates" each year in my 2nd grade classrooms. In 3 years, I have found only 2 children who seem to be independent readers on or above grade level. The rest have simply amazed me at their poor skills and yet they were discontinued.

CLEAR has worked some wonders for my low readers. Thank you, thank you, thank you

[Teacher] & [teacher] provide an invaluable service to my students. An extemely large number of my students benefitted from this program and prevented retention.

I'm sorry - but because I'm a D.H. teacher, I don't know much about the CLEAR program. This survey would probably be more helpful if given to a regular teacher!!!

The student on this form is a special case. She has been tested and she qualifies for a DH class. But, I have been pleased with results from students being served this year in Reading Recovery.

The reading program was taken from our school this year. We need it desperately.

[Pupil] has been somewhat successful in reading but has recently reached some type of plateau. [Pupil] has been tested for L.D. and has been recommended for placement.

Appendix J

Comments from the Parent Survey

Columbus Public Schools
CLEAR-Reading Recovery Program

COMMENTS FROM THE PARENT SURVEY
1987-88

I'm very glad that it help my son [Pupil] in reading, and how to sound out the words. I think it's good that they have a program to help children in Reading.

I really do not [?] what the Clear-Reading program is. It was never explain to me. [Pupil] does not seem to be reading any better. He needs extra help with his speech to be able to read. I feel!

I think it's a good program to have. It did alot for my son's reading.

I met and talked to the reading recovery teacher at my parnet[parent] & teacher conferences this year My daughter doesn't do as well now she is not in her reading recovery I think

This is her first time I will like to come and visited

My child has learned to read very well since this program. I'm very pleased cause before she couldn't read at all.

I think it help's a lot of children that have learning disabilities!

It has help my child reading ability a lot and he likes to read books all the time now, and I work with him at home and when I take him to the store he read labels, signs. I didn't know he had a reading problem but now he does very well with the help of the Clear-Reading Recovery program.

The reason that I never visited the reading class I had no way to get there [Pupil] really enjoys reading

I am very happy with this program. At the start of the year my son didn't know the ABC now he is reading. It has been a great help.

The Reading Recovery program has improved my childs Reading & Writing in the later part of the school. I would be satisfied if the school had this program for K-4th grade level.

My daughter is helping her second grade sister in her reading and im pretty proud of her

I feel that the program is one of the best my children have been in. My daughter has really gotten alot out of it. And her teacher is really good.

No coment

It helps children read better, and understand what they read.

I think it is a great program [teacher] is great with my child. I hope that every child that needs help in the future can be helped through Reading Recovery

Being a single parent, it's hard to know exactly how to help your children. Through this program, not only has it helped him it's helped me in many ways. Please continue. We are very greatful.

Reading is better writting is bad.

I feel they should be graded on their own level (indivual) not as a group
I don't approval of curve grading!!

I feel the program has helped my child very very much.

The Reading Recovery is needed in other grades as well. My oldes girl still have a problem reading, and she is in the 5th grade. Please keep helping the children, and we parents will keep helping too. Thank you for caring!

I truely happy that we have program for children at school thank you so much

I think the program is terrific it has helped my little girl read. She comes home and reads to me her stories!

The Clear-Reading Recovery Program is a great program that should continue. My daughter is doing great and she is no longer in the program because of her improvement. Thank you.

I feel good about [pupil's] Grades and His Reading He is doing Really good and I Really do thank his teachers

I am glad my child has had an oppurtunity to have this program its helped her to like to read.

My child seems to do much better in the reading recovery program than she does reading out of her own First grade reader. She really enjoyed reading recovery!!

[Pupil] would have never made it thru first grade without the R.R. Program. This program should definately continue - for there is too many children who really need that extra help. I am very glad [school] has it.

There was a very big Improvement in my child. I was really Happy Because during the Middle of the school year I thought She was going to fail Thank to you.

I am a Foster Parent and I did not have [pupil] at the beginning of school. I really don't think his reading is that bad for 1st grade.

I am not sure how she is doing in her reading I haven't seen anything she has done in her reading class.

I think that the Reading Recovery program is a very successful program, and was very glad that my child was able to be helped and improve in reading. I hope the program last and help kids that really need the help to improve there reading and writing

I knew for sure that my child knew somewhat how to read. She just needed a little improving by encouragement. This shes received through this program This is an effective program

[Teacher] is exceptional in teaching the Reading Recovery Program

it help my child alot. I am real happy about it. I am glad my child was in it. thank you for helping my child.

I'm glad that there is a program to help other people to read. And i hope that it stay in the school & other place's

I think that the Reading teacher has help [pupil] a lot considering she has a little speaech problem But her speech has improved a tol

I feel it has helped very much. I am glad she was in the program.

I think that the reading program is a very good program and [pupil] has learn a lot

At the beginning of the first grade my child did not know how to read or pronounce words at all. The reading recovery program had done a great job with him. He can do it all now. Thanks!

"It was very good for my child [pupil] . She has learned a let." Thank you very much

[Teacher] is my childs teacher, she is very concerned with [pupil], & has spent alot of time with her. Thanks for all of your help.

The Clear-Reading Recovery Program has been a big help to my daughter, it was a surprise for me to know she was put in the Program I thank God for the program because now my daughter is very aggressive & sure about what she's reading & doing

My child is very shy and has a hard time being comfortable around others. This school year has been hard on him. He liked his reading aid but not his classroom teacher. This had alot to do with what he would and would not do.

[Teacher] really does a super job and makes a child feel at ease in reading.

My son has done very well, he is now out of Reading Recovery I am proud and very pleased. Thank you!

I receive a letter earlier in school stating my son was in the program. He brought work home daily. His reading improved so much he was taken out of the program.

My little boy wants to learn and is very smart but he gives up to easily.

I am very glad my child is in Reading Recovery so that she can learn to read & get caught up in her reading skills & hope it be there when my son starts school if he needs it

I was very pleased with my child's progress. His teacher was very good with [pupil] and, He really enjoyed her and, her class.

I feel that this is a very good program. [Pupil's] progress is great.

My daughter just started in Reading Recovery Program, & I'm impressed with how she's sounding her words out. Thank you, for giving her the opportunity to be a better reader. [Teacher] is GREAT!

I am greatly satisfied with the reading recovery Program. It has helped [pupil] tremendously. THANK YOU

Very effective program I am glad [pupil] was a part of it

Yes I thinks that the Reading Program is very good, and it to bad that all children can't get into it.

Additional Comments

Item 6

To writing sentences not stories

Item 7

Sometimes
Sometimes

Item 8

Most of the time

Item 9

Not Sure

Item 10

was in the program

Item 12

very much

Item 13

Sentences

Item 15

She cried when she had to leave program

Item 16

felt

Item 17

I see her when I picked up my daughter

Item 18

Because I have not heard from her I have not called

Items 18 & 19

But I am concern in my child learning